

1888, No. 4, Vol. 2, S.

[Published Quarterly]

THE LIBRARY

EDITED BY
JWMARBLISTER
EST. 1883

OCTOBER
1909



THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION was founded in 1877, and in 1890 received a Royal Charter in recognition of the value of its public work. The membership of the Association is not confined to Librarians. Its main objects are to unite all persons engaged or interested in Library Administration or in Bibliographical Research. For this purpose it has instituted classes in Librarianship and Bibliography, holds examinations in the above subjects, and issues certificates which are now recognised as essential qualifications for appointments as Library Assistants or Librarians. The annual subscription is one guinea, in return for which the Member receives the monthly organ of the Association, is entitled to the free use of the lending library maintained by the Association, and to attend its monthly and annual meetings. For membership forms apply to

MRS. REILLY, 24, Whitecomb Street, W.C.

THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION RECORD.

CONTENTS OF OCTOBER NUMBER, 1909.

CURRENT VIEWS.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS.

LEGAL BIBLIOGRAPHY (Sheffield). By W. T. FREEMANTLE.

PROFESSIONAL PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

LIBRARY ASSOCIATION: PROCEEDINGS AND OFFICIAL NOTICES.

MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

LIBRARY ASSISTANTS ASSOCIATION.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MESSRS. ELLIS

Dealers in OLD and RARE BOOKS, MANUSCRIPTS and ENGRAVINGS

29 NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

(Business established by Julius Brindley in 1725)

LIBRARIES arranged and catalogued; large or small collections of old Books purchased; Rare Books and Prints searched for and reported.

SALES BY AUCTION attended and commissions carefully executed; all descriptions of BOOK-BINDING and repairs to old books undertaken and carried out by the most skilful craftsmen; London Agents for the VELLUCENT Bindings of Messrs. Cedric Chivers, of Bath; Sole British Agents for the facsimile reproductions of those two famous MSS. the BREVIARIUM GRIMANI, of Venice, and the HORTULUS ANIMÆ, of Vienna; CATALOGUES of new purchases issued periodically; inspection of the stock invited.

WORKS BY THE LATE JOHN DAVIDSON

Self's the Man: a Tragi-Comedy. Crown 8vo, cloth.

5/- net.

Testaments—

1. The Testament of a Vivisector. Fcap. 4to. Sewed.	6d. net.
2. The Testament of a Man Forbid. Fcap. 4to. Sewed.	6d. net.
3. The Testament of an Empire-Builder. Fcap. 4to. Sewed.	1/- net.
4. The Testament of a Prime Minister. Impl. 16mo, buckram.	3/6 net.
A Queen's Romance. Imperial 16mo, buckram.	3/6 net.
The Knight of the Maypole. Imperial 16mo, paper boards.	5/- net.
A Rosary. Imperial 16mo, buckram.	5/- net.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, ALEXANDER MORING LTD. LONDON W

N.

charter
is not
ed to
stituted
Issues
library
is the
nding
For

C.

CES.

ICS

of old
rted
ated
nder-
r the
British
. the
LUS
ssued

- net.

N W.

THE LIBRARY.

A REVIEW (QUARTERLY).

EDITED BY

J. Y. W. MACALISTER and A. W. POLLARD, in collaboration with
KONRAD BURGER, LÉOPOLD DELISLE, and MELVIL DEWEY.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON ; by JOHN DOVER WILSON	337
THE CARE OF BOOKS IN EARLY IRISH MONASTERIES ; by ERNEST A. SAVAGE	362
RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE ; by ELIZABETH LEE	371
THE SO-CALLED GUTENBERG DOCUMENTS ; by J. H. HESSELS	386
ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER ; by W. W. GREG	418
REVIEWS ; by A. W. P.	443
INDEX	449

For the ANHYDROUS laying of DUST in LIBRARIES
USE The "DUST-ALLAYER" Co.'s UNEQUALLED
FLORIGENE (A Regd. Name
suggested by
Floor-Hygiene)

(Awarded the BRONZE MEDAL of the Royal Sanitary Institute)
On every kind of Wood, Concrete, Linoleum and other flooring,
"Florigene" is an Ordurous "Dust-Allayer."

"Florigene" (No. 2) is a Combined "Dust-Allayer" and powerful DISINFECTANT which has been examined by a well-known Bacteriologist whose important Report shows that the Specific Germ of TYPHOID FEVER was completely destroyed within FIVE MINUTES from the moment of contact, while the STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS (probably the most resistant of disease germs, which produces boils and blood-poisoning), was completely destroyed in SEVEN-AND-A-HALF MINUTES.

The Complete Bacteriological Report may be had upon application.

No scrubbing (unless preferred) or sprinkling of any kind—therefore no injurious moisture—the daily sweeping alone required to clean the floors. Books, Furniture, Apparatus, &c., seldom require dusting or cleaning. "Florigene" is extensively used in Government (including H.M. Patent Office Library, &c.) and Municipal Buildings, Public and Private Libraries, Museums, Art Galleries, Offices, &c.,—and has been for many years—with highly satisfactory results. Each application lasts for 2 to 6 months, according to wear. For further particulars and testimonials, write:—

THE "DUST-ALLAYER" CO.

165, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.

CONTRACTORS to the ADMIRALTY, H.M. OFFICE of WORKS, WAR OFFICE, etc.

PUBLICATIONS OF LIBRACO Ltd.

MANUAL OF LIBRARY ECONOMY

By JAMES DUFF BROWN, Borough Librarian, Islington. Demy 8vo, cloth, 422 pp., illus., 8/- net.

A completely revised and extended edition forming the most comprehensive text-book of general library practice in existence. The subjects dealt with are:—Library Legislation, Committees, Architecture, Book Selection, Classification, Cataloguing, Fittings and Appliances, Public Service, Museums and Art Galleries, etc.

GUIDE TO LIBRARIANSHIP

By JAMES DUFF BROWN, Borough Librarian, Islington. 8vo, cloth, 89 pp. Post free 2/- net.

A complete series of Reading Lists in sections according to the syllabus of the Library Association Examinations: Literary History, Bibliography, Classification, Cataloguing, Library Organization, Library Routine. With an important section dealing with Factors and Percentages relating to every department of Library Work and statistics, specially adapted for the use of Librarians and members of Library Committees.

SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION

By JAMES DUFF BROWN, Borough Librarian, Islington. Royal 8vo, cloth, 392 pp. 15/- net.

A complete system of Classification for British Libraries, with descriptive introduction, index, and tables for subdividing single subjects.

MANUAL OF DESCRIPTIVE ANNOTATION FOR LIBRARY CATALOGUES

By ERNEST A. SAVAGE, Chief Librarian, Wallasey Public Libraries. With chapter on Evaluation, and Historical Note by E. A. BAKER, D.Litt. Crown 8vo, cloth, 155 pp. 5/- net.

LIBRARY ECONOMICS

Royal 8vo, paper, 150 pp., illus. 2/- net.

Consists of practical articles on actual working methods used in the Public Libraries of the United Kingdom, written by members of the Libraries' Staffs. Some of the contents are:—A Dictionary of the Terms and Phrases used in Library Work, Home Binderies, Card Changing and Appliances, Students' Supplementary Tickets, Registration of Borrowers, Delivery Stations, etc.

CLASSIFICATION OF LIBRARY ECONOMY & OFFICE PAPERS

By L. STANLEY JAST, Chief Librarian, Croydon; Hon. Sec., Library Association. Royal 8vo, cloth, 56 pp. 2/- net.

The practical application of Classification to Office Papers.

MANUAL OF PRACTICAL INDEXING

By A. L. CLARKE, Librarian, Royal Society of Medicine. Crown 8vo, cloth, 184 pp. 5/- net.

"It is as complete and thorough a treatise on indexing as any one could possibly desire."—*Scotsman*.

"A simple, concise exposition of indexing practice."—*Library Journal*.

THE SHEAF CATALOGUE

By J. D. STEWART, Islington Public Libraries. Containing a "Guide to Cataloguers' Reference Books." Royal 8vo, cloth 55 pp., illus. 2/- net.

A practical handbook on the subject, containing chapters on The Variety of Sheaf Catalogues, Materials and Technique, Handwriting for MS. Catalogues, Rules for Author, Title, Subject, and Dictionary Sheaf Catalogues, Miscellaneous Hints and a Bibliography of Manuscript Cataloguing.

THE ADJUSTABLE CLASSIFICATION

By JAMES DUFF BROWN, Borough Librarian, Islington. 8vo, paper covers, interleaved. Post free.

A complete classification system for small libraries. 1/- net.

BOOK SELECTION

By JAMES D. STEWART and Miss O. E. CLARKE, Islington Public Libraries. Royal 8vo, paper covers. 6d. net.

Published for the Library Association

CLASS LIST OF BEST BOOKS AND ANNUAL OF BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Editor, H. V. HOPWOOD, Patent Office Lib.

Vol. I. 1905-6. Royal 8vo, 70 pp.

(Post free ad. extra) 1/- net.

Vol. II. 1906-7. Royal 8vo, 86 pp.

(Post free ad. extra) 1/- net.

Vol. III. 1907-8. Royal 8vo, 114 pp.

(Post free ad. extra) 1/- net.

CATALOGUING RULES. Author and Title Entries

Compiled by the Committee of American Library Association and the Library Association.

Paper covers, 2/- net; cloth covers, 2/6 net; cloth, interleaved, 3/- net.

60 WILSON STREET, FINSBURY SQUARE, E.C.

P. M. BARNARD, M.A.,

(FORMERLY CLASSICAL SCHOLAR OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE)

ANTIQUARIAN BOOKSELLER
10 Dudley Road, Tunbridge Wells.

ALSO AT

85 BRIDGE STREET, MANCHESTER (near John Rylands Library)

Catalogues Issued. Books sought for and reported gratis.
P. M. BARNARD undertakes the formation of Collections or Libraries on special subjects.

SELECTIONS FROM THE
DE LA MORE PRESS LIST

OLD LONDON: A Series of Fifty Reproductions of Old Engravings Illustrative of the London of our Ancestors

[Second Edition.]

Compiled by WALTER L. McNAY. Large 8vo, cloth. 3/6 net.

"Among books of the season that have permanent and educative value, Mr. Walter L. McNay's *Old London: A Series of Fifty Reproductions of Old Engravings Illustrative of the London of Our Ancestors*," taken a high place. Mr. McNay has chosen his subjects well from the prints which John Bowles issued at his shop in Cornhill, from the etchings of John Thomas Smith, and from the drawings of Shepherd, Miller, and other topographical artists who recorded London streets and buildings with loving accuracy. . . . Mr. McNay has arranged his volume on the old and useful plan of one page of text to one picture, and in a fairly exhaustive reading I have found accuracy and compactness of statement. . . . Old London is a kind of fairy-land, and it is not necessary to be an antiquary to love it. Mr. McNay has produced an admirable pictorial guide to its sights in the spirit of Stow's words: 'What London hath been in antient Time men may here see.'"—*T.P.'s Weekly*.

DUTCH PAINTING IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

By G. HERMINE MARIUS. Translated by ALEXANDER TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS, with a photogravure and 130 reproductions in half-tone. Royal 8vo, panelled cloth gilt. 15/- net.

The Author of this work—herself an artist—is well known in Holland as a critic of great individuality. Her studies of Ruskin, the three brothers Marié, and her book on Rembrandt have been much appreciated for their sound judgment, a quality not always allied to such enthusiasm as she displays in dealing with her subject.

"In this notable work the subject is treated historically and critically, from the work of J. W. Pieneman and Cornelius Kruseman, those fathers and founders of nineteenth-century Dutch painting, to the representatives of 'the New Formula,' many of whom will be but names, and new names, to English readers. Over a hundred reproductions serve to illustrate this interesting volume."—*Westminster Gazette*.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, ALEXANDER MORING LTD. LONDON W

DE LA MORE BOOKLETS

Size, Pott 8vo, 3½ in. by 6 in.

Price 6d. net each in art wrappers; three in a box for 1/6 net, or six in a box for 3/- net. Also bound in cloth gilt and gilt top, 1/- net; in moreen gilt and gilt edges, 1/6 net; and in full lamskin, extra gilt and gilt edges, 2/6 net.

The "De La More" Booklets have won their way into general favour as substitutes for the useless and ephemeral Christmas and birthday card. They are beautifully printed at the De La More Press on very fine paper specially made for them, and are bound very carefully, and in an artistic manner.

1 Charles Lamb's <i>Dream Children</i>	15 Keats' <i>Odes</i>
and <i>The Child Angel</i>	16 <i>Abraham and Isaac</i> : an old
3 Washington Irving's <i>Christmas</i>	English <i>Miracle Play</i>
<i>Day</i>	17 Fitzgerald's <i>Rubaiyat of Omar</i>
3 Rossetti's <i>Hand and Soul</i>	<i>Khayyam</i>
4 Milton's <i>Morning of Christ's</i>	18 Smart's <i>Song to David</i>
<i>Nativity</i>	19 <i>The Book of Ruth</i>
5 Keats' <i>Eve of St. Agnes</i>	20 De Quincey's <i>Suspiria</i>
6 Shelley's <i>Adonais</i>	21 <i>Tom Pinch's Ride to London</i>
7 Wordsworth's <i>Ode on Immor-</i>	by Charles Dickens
<i>tality</i>	22 Shelley's <i>Sensitive Plant</i>
8 Byron's <i>Hebrew Melodies</i>	23 Browning's <i>Saul</i>
9 Milton's <i>Lycidas</i>	24 Milton's <i>Il Penseroso, L'Alle-</i>
10 Carlyle on Shakespeare	<i>gro and Arcades</i>
11 Goethe on Shakespeare	25 <i>The Dream of Gerontius</i> , by
12 Emerson on Shakespeare	Cardinal Newman
13 Coleridge's <i>Ancient Mariner</i>	26 Rossetti's <i>Blessed Damozel</i>
14 Shelley's <i>Cloud, Skylark, and</i>	27 Coleridge's <i>Christabel</i>
<i>West Wind</i>	

"The 'De La More Booklets' are a happy idea. They consist of classical masterpieces in paper covers, such as Shelley's 'Adonais,' Keats' 'Eve of St. Agnes,' and Milton's 'Hymn on the Morning of Christ's Nativity.' If the De La More Press can make such masterpieces into common presents they will be doing a great service."—*Athenaeum*.

"Several charming booklets have reached me from the De La More and more Press!"—
BARON DE B— W—, in *Punch*.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, ALEXANDER MORING LTD. LONDON W

<p>DELICIOUS COFFEE.</p> <p>RED</p> <p>WHITE</p> <p>BLUE</p> <p>For Breakfast & after Dinner.</p>	<p>PEATMOOR</p> <p><u>Old Scotch</u></p> <p>WHISKY.</p> <p>"Soft, Mellow, Delightful, Carries the Wild Rough Scent of the Highland Breeze."</p>
--	---

THE LIBRARY.

EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON

I.

DN 1529 Martin de Keyser, a printer living at Antwerp, issued a book from his press which was destined to make no small stir in the world, though its former importance is now well-nigh forgotten. The said book was a Latin drama, entitled 'Acolastus,' by a certain Willem de Volder, who, after the humanistic fashion, called himself Fullonius or Gnapheus, the latter being the name by which he is generally known. He was born in 1493 at the Hague, and afterwards became a schoolmaster there; but being suspected of heretical, that is to say Protestant, leanings, he had to fly from his town in 1528, and died in 1568 as an exile. 'Acolastus' was, therefore, written by a schoolmaster, a fact which goes some way towards explaining not only its peculiarities, but also its significance. It was, in fact, the best and by far the most important, though not actually the earliest, of a group of scholastic dramas which, originating in the Netherlands, made their influence felt more immediately in Germany, but eventually all over Europe.

The comedies of Terence had been a school text-book throughout the Middle Ages, and towards the end of the fifteenth century it became quite a common thing for scholars to act them. But greatly as the prestige of all Latin authors, and especially of Terence, increased at the time of the Renaissance, there were two things about the Latin comedy that tended to make the schoolmaster of the sixteenth century, with his growing sense of the ethical function of his office, cast about for a more fitting channel through which to pour the treasures of the Latin language into the mind of his pupil. Terence was neither Christian nor moral; and though Luther's famous remarks upon the Latin comedy, and Melanchthon's constant support of its claims, prove that the common sense of the age saw no harm in bringing the young into contact with the realities of life, it was natural that many should feel that the didactic element in the school drama might be made more prominent.

In answer to this need, a remarkable series of dramas were produced which sought to combine all that was essentially instructive in the Terentian comedy with the necessary Christian atmosphere and the required didactic point. In other words, a new Latin drama arose which was a cross between the Latin comedy and the morality play. As it happened there was one, and perhaps only one, story in the Bible which could provide a convenient basis for this curious dramatic hybrid. The parable of the Prodigal Son contained a moral lesson which was admirably adapted for the consideration of the

youthful mind, and incidentally admitted of an interpretation that gave strong support to the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith; while, on the other hand, a loop-hole was found for the introduction of the whole Terentian machinery of parasites, slaves, and meretrices in the half-dozen words 'wasted his substance with riotous living,' which were expanded into more than twice that number of scenes. And though, as has been said, Gnapheus was not the first to see the dramatic possibilities of the parable, his 'Acolastus' created the type of prodigal son drama which almost all subsequent writers followed; and it will be well, therefore, to consider its characters and story somewhat closely.

Gnapheus follows the Bible narrative with remarkable fidelity except in one point: he leaves out the elder brother, the only indication of his existence being a single reference to the prodigal as 'natu minor.' Shorn of this incident, which Gnapheus probably felt would have been an excrescence upon the unity of his drama, the story falls into four divisions: the departure of the prodigal with his portion; his riotous living in a far country; his degradation and hunger; and, finally, his return home and a joyful reception. To how large an extent 'Acolastus' was pure Terentian comedy, is seen from the fact that two and a half out of five acts are taken up by an elaboration of the second of these divisions. As the curtain rises we find Pelargus, the father, in deep distress concerning the resolve of his son to leave home and see the world. To him enters

340 EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON.

Eubulus, a direct loan from the morality, symbolizing prudence or foresight. He advises the king to allow his son to go, pointing out that to thwart him would be useless, and only produce a breach which would prevent his return when he had sown his wild oats. We must suppose, though we are not told so, that Eubulus was represented as an old grey-beard; and that Philautus, who carries on the next scene with the prodigal Acolastus, was meant to be a young man. He also is borrowed from the morality, and embodies the prodigal's self-love, as the old man had embodied the prudence of Pelargus, for it is he who inspires Acolastus with his desire for travel and his arrogance towards his father. Then follows the division of the inheritance, which Gnapheus by a happy stroke describes as 'decem talenta.' In taking leave of his son, Pelargus gives him much good advice and a copy of the Bible. The latter, however, at the suggestion of Philautus, is afterwards thrown away. The far country into which Acolastus now journeys is the land of Terentian comedy. Two parasites are waiting for prey as he passes through the market-place, and at the sight of his belt bulging with the ten talents, they pounce upon him and carry him off to a pandar's house. Here at the command of Acolastus a great banquet is prepared, and Lais is sent for. The love-making between her and the prodigal is the finest piece of writing in a fine play, and the whole scene in the house of Sannio is a sufficient proof that to the educationalist of that age, suppression of fact was not considered necessary so long as the true moral was clearly and correctly

pointed. The ruin of Acolastus is brought about the following day by one of the parasites, who wins all that is left of his substance by means of loaded dice. This incident may perhaps have been suggested to Gnapheus by Brandt's famous 'Narrenschiff,' in which there is a woodcut representing two children playing with dice and cards. In any case dice were, perhaps rightly, regarded by all sixteenth century moralists as the symbol of moral degradation in youth. Acolastus is now driven penniless and naked out of doors, Lais being the first to round upon him and rob him of his clothes. In addition to all his other misfortunes, a famine has come upon the land. He cannot dig; to beg he is ashamed, and eventually he takes service with a farmer who sets him to feed his pigs. During this period of his career he utters several soliloquies, which are not only important as showing his gradual transition from bitter despair to hopeful repentance, but as the prototypes of many more famous soliloquies in literature. He eventually, of course, returns home to his father, throws himself at his feet uttering the words of the parable, and is received with rejoicing and feasts.

The play fully deserved the fame that awaited it, which was considerable. Dr. Bolte, its modern editor, notes no less than forty-eight editions and reprints before 1588. It was translated three times into German, once into French, and once into English; while its renown spreading to Italy led Guicciardini to hail Gnapheus as 'primus apud inferiores Germanos poeta comicus.' In short, 'Acolastus' immediately acquired what is described

342 EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON.

in modern publishers' advertisements as a European reputation. Yet, in as much as Gnapheus wrote primarily as a schoolmaster, it was to the scholastic world he made his greatest appeal. The 'christian Terence' became a rival of the pagan. His play took rank with the classics as a school text-book. The English translation by John Palsgrave, which appeared in 1540, was a line for line, word for word, rendering, intended to be read by school-boys; while in 1564 an edition was published in Paris with detailed notes and vocabulary. That a book which was used in the schools of Germany, France, England, and the Netherlands, to mention no other countries, should have escaped imitation was impossible in an age innocent of any sense of the sin of plagiarism. 'Acolastus,' writes a German authority on the prodigal son dramas, 'served as a model and a source for many another dramatisation of the parable,'¹ and it would probably be difficult to over-estimate the extent of its influence.

The drama of the Prodigal Son in time gave birth to a new type, which we may describe as the drama of student life. Of this the 'Studentes' of Stymmelius, which was itself directly modelled on 'Acolastus,' was the most famous, though not the best example. Professor Herford has shown in his stimulating and suggestive 'Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the 16th Century,' that George Gascoigne's 'Glasse of Government' is one of these student dramas; but

¹ Holstein, 'Das Drama vom verlorenen Sohn.' See also Franz Spengler's 'Der verlorene Sohn im Drama des xvi. Jahrhunderts,' a better and more recent treatment of the subject.

he maintains that with this exception Ingelend's 'Disobedient Child' is the only 'English version of the Prodigal Son story of which we know anything in detail.' This is surely too positive a statement, even as far as the drama is concerned. The interlude of 'Nice Wanton,' with its prologue harping upon the text 'spare the rod and spoil the child,' its riotous youngsters, and its grave matron Eulalia, who takes the place of Eubulus, is all of a piece with the Dutch-Latin drama, and the present writer feels convinced that a careful examination of the English dramatic literature of the sixteenth century would reveal many other cases of borrowing from the same source.¹ It is not, however, with the influence of the Prodigal Son upon English drama that we are here concerned. 'Acolastus' and its kindred provided the plot and characters for an important section of the prose fiction which entertained the ladies and gentlemen of Elizabeth's court. Indeed 'Euphues' itself, the first English novel, and the most famous romance that the age produced, was a direct adaptation of the Prodigal Son story as developed by the Dutch dramatists. As this view runs counter to all accepted theories on the subject, the reader must excuse a somewhat elaborate consideration of the matter.

II.

It was for long a commonplace of Elizabethan criticism that Lyly's 'Euphues' was little more than a recasting of Lord North's 'Diall of Princes,'

¹ See, for example, Malone Society 'Collections,' pp. 27, 106, and the introduction to Brandl's 'Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England.'

which was itself a translation of Guevara's 'El relox de principes,' and that our first English novel was, therefore, both as to style and matter, an importation from the Peninsula. The theory, which was first propounded in 1881 by Dr. Landmann,¹ and still continues to be associated with his name, has of late years ceased to command quite the unhesitating acceptance which it once enjoyed. In 1905 the present writer attempted to prove that as far as 'euphuism' was concerned, the theory had been stated much too positively; and the latest treatment of the Elizabethan novel, that of Professor Atkins in the third volume of the 'Cambridge History of English Literature,' rejects in emphatic terms the idea that Lyly's style was of Spanish origin. Up to the present, however, the second half of Dr. Landmann's thesis has remained unchallenged, and Professor Atkins himself confidently asserts that the 'body' of 'Euphues' is drawn from North's 'Diall of Princes,' of which it is in fact 'little more than a reordering.' Lyly's latest editor, Mr. R. W. Bond, warns us, indeed, that the debt to Guevara has been 'if anything overstated,' and that we must 'guard against the notion that Lyly makes frequent verbal drafts upon the Diall'; but goes on, nevertheless, to declare that 'the form, tone, and subjects of Guevara's work are largely the model' of the 'Anatomy of Wyt,' and to cite Dr. Landmann in support of his statement.² When he passes from generalisation to particular instance, the evidence he brings forward to prove

¹ 'Der Euphuismus.'

² 'The Works of John Lyly,' Vol. I., pp. 154-6.

the connection are not very impressive. The not uncommon classical names Lucilla and Livia¹ occur in both books, and in both Lucilla is represented as a light-minded daughter who merits the reproof of her father. Again, both Llyl and Guevara devote space to the subject of education ; but this is nothing more than to say that each was the child of an age to which the topic of education was more than ordinarily entralling. Moreover, it has lately been proved that what Llyl did not take from Plutarch for his educational treatise 'Euphues and his Ephœbus,' he borrowed from Erasmus.² The references in 'Euphues' to Athens and the emperor, of which Mr. Bond would make capital, indicate in our opinion nothing more than a desire on the author's part to give a classical, that is to say learned, atmosphere to his book ; though, indeed, it is not necessary to boggle over the emperor at all, since there was no need for Llyl to go back to Marcus Aurelius for an example : he had one in Germany. For the rest, the alleged resemblances chiefly concern various letters which lie quite outside the main story, and most of which are admittedly as likely to have been taken from Plutarch as from Guevara.

Now we do not wish to deny that Llyl had read North's 'Diall,' and that it exerted a certain and even at times a verbal influence upon him ; but we maintain that to describe 'Euphues' as a 'reorder-

¹ In point of fact the lady in North's 'Diall' is not Livia but Lybia.

² De Vocht, *De Invloed van Erasmus op de Engelsche Tooneel-literatuur der XVI^e en XVII^e Eeuwen*. Eerste del. Gent, 1908.

ing' of its predecessor is to be guilty of a gross exaggeration, an exaggeration, moreover, which would never have occurred to anybody to make had not Dr. Landmann broached the idea that 'euphuism' was first manufactured in Spain. In short, what was once used as an argument to support a now exploded theory still hangs on as part of the critical furniture surrounding 'Euphues' simply because no one has taken the trouble to get rid of it. For it would be impossible, we venture to assert, for one not previously biassed in favour of the Spanish theory, to read 'Euphues' in conjunction with the 'Diall of Princes' and see any resemblance between them. When he says this, the present writer does not forget that he is condemning himself with others. In his little book on 'John Llyl,' published four years ago, he followed Mr. Bond in this even more blindly than Mr. Bond himself had followed Dr. Landmann. Let us turn for a moment to the 'Diall of Princes' itself, for only by so doing can we realise how absurd is the theory that would make it a model for 'Euphues.'

The fact that the Guevara book was one of the most popular treatises of the sixteenth century and that its editions in Spanish, French, and English are to be numbered by dozens, speaks volumes for the toughness of our forefathers' literary digestion; for to the modern reader it is insufferably dull. Its fame must be attributed partly to the *alto estilo* in which it was written, and partly to the fact that it belonged to what was at that time a fashionable school of literature. It was in fact one of those 'moral court treatises' which were called into

existence by the monarchical tendency in politics, and of which Castiglione's 'Il Cortegiano' was the most famous example. North's 'Diall'¹ is a formidable volume running to 268 folios of double-columned black-letter. It is divided into three books and an appendix containing fifteen letters. After wading through three long, exceedingly wearisome, and at times almost incoherent prefaces, the reader at length comes to the first book, wherein he is informed 'what excellency is in the prince that is a good Christian: and contrariwise, what evilles do folowe him, that is a cruell tyrante.' And he is accordingly somewhat surprised to find that the first three chapters deal with the pagan philosopher Marcus Aurelius. This, however, will give him a clue to two very important facts about the book as a whole: first, that it is entirely devoid of any cohesion or arrangement except of the roughest kind, and second that the only real thread that runs throughout is the personality of Marcus Aurelius, incidents from whose life, or letters from whose pen are constantly brought in to support some argument of the author's. The book is, in fact, one of those compilations from classical sources of which the age was so fond, its object being to act as a moral textbook for those in authority, to whom it held up the philosopher-emperor as the perfect pattern.

¹ North's book is often spoken of as the second translation, but the 'Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius,' published in 1534, and running into fourteen editions before 1588, was translated by Lord Berners (through the French), not from 'El Relox,' but from the 'Libro Aureo de Marco Aurelio,' the original and much shorter draft, which was printed without Guevara's consent, as he explains at full length in the 'Argument' of his 'Relox.'

Where is the resemblance to 'Euphues' in all this? Lyly moralises and Guevara moralises, since they both happened to live in the sixteenth century; and sometimes they moralised upon the same topics, since the moralists' favourite subjects are limited. But there the coincidence ceases. There is, as we shall presently see, a story running through 'Euphues,' not, indeed, very elaborate in character, but much more definite and well thought out than is usually allowed by critics. In the 'Diall of Princes' there is no story whatever. 'Euphues' contains several distinct and not uninteresting characters. Guevara has but one character, Marcus Aurelius, and even he is little more than a label on a bundle of letters. We may, therefore, consign the theory of Lyly's debt to Guevara to the limbo of discredited literary dogmas and turn to the real source of the euphuist's inspiration,—the story of the prodigal son. To make clear the relationship between two persons at first sight so different as Euphues and the prodigal, it will be necessary to look closely at the story and character of our first English novel.

III.

Euphuism has too long been allowed to obscure the interest of 'Euphues,' and much as has been written upon Lyly, no one has yet taken the trouble to read his novel properly and to notice the manner in which he elected to tell it. The critics, in fact, have not been able to see the story for the style.

EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON. 349

And yet there are many curious and instructive points about the 'make-up' of the plot and characters that well repay study. The book was published in two parts, 'The Anatomy of Wyt' and 'Euphues and his England,' but for our present purpose it is enough to confine our attention to the first part alone. The sequel is simply a reproduction of the 'Anatomy' in English dress as it were; the same characters reappear, even though in some cases different names may be given to them. It is not seriously maintained, moreover, by any critic that Guevara had any appreciable influence upon the second part, in which indeed Llyl is quite obviously attempting to give a picture of the court of Elizabeth. Let us give a brief outline of the plot before considering it in detail.

Euphues, a wealthy, handsome, exceedingly talented and at the same time somewhat arrogant, young Athenian, determines to leave his native city and travel. In the course of his wanderings he comes to Naples, where he finds 'all things necessary and in redinesse that myght eyther allure the minde to luste or entice the hearte to follye.' Here he set up his abode and soon 'wanted no companions whiche courted hym continuallye with sundrye kindes of deuises, whereby they myght eyther soake hys purse to reape commoditie, or sooth hys person to wynne credite.' But he behaved very warily and did not allow himself to be entrapped. An old gentleman named Eubulus, however, seeing that he stood in some danger, determined to give him good advice before it was too late. This he did in a lengthy discourse which, starting from the assump-

350 EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON.

tion that Euphues had been over-indulged in childhood, launched forth into a disquisition upon the evils of spoiling children, and concluded with counsel for the future. Euphues contemptuously rejects this advice, and soon afterwards forms a friendship of the closest nature with a young Neapolitan named Philautus. The said Philautus is in love with Lucilla, the daughter of one of the chief men in the city, and when Euphues one day accompanies his friend to her house, he at once falls in love with the damsel, whose 'Lilly cheeks,' we are told, were 'dyed with a Vermilion red.' They all sit down to supper, after which Euphues entertains the company with a discourse upon the subject of love, but overcome by his passion suddenly breaks off and leaves the house, unconscious that his love has been reciprocated by the faithless Lucilla. This mutual passion now leads to long soliloquies on the part of the lovers, who are brought together once again by the unsuspecting Philautus. This time Euphues finds his lady playing at cards with her friends. A conversation ensues, but is broken short by Lucilla's father, who entering suddenly, tells Philautus he has some business for him in Venice, and carries him off, confiding Lucilla to the care of Euphues. Our hero takes advantage of this to declare his passion, and Lucilla, after some maidenly hesitation, accepts him as her lover. Meanwhile Philautus returns, and, backed by her father's sanction, asks his mistress to name the wedding-day. After some shuffling she admits that her heart no longer belongs to Philautus but to Euphues. Angry letters pass between the two

EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON. 351

friends, followed by complete alienation. However, Lucilla, the cause of the breach, is to become the cause of its healing, for within a short space of time she throws over Euphues in his turn for a third gentleman, which naturally leads to reconciliation between her two rejected lovers. Her father in vain warns her of her fickle character, and repents of his folly in spoiling her as a child. She persists in her course, breaks her father's heart, and comes herself to a fearful end, the nature of which Lyly refuses to disclose in the story, but which one of the letters at the end gives us to understand was that of a harlot dying in extreme misery and wretchedness. Euphues, on the other hand, jilted by Lucilla, becomes a changed man. In a long soliloquy he expresses his deep repentance for ever having left his home and for rejecting the excellent counsel of Eubulus; and after referring to his profligacy, he determines to amend his life, return to study, leave the world and become a model of virtue for the future. By a natural process he has himself become Eubulus. He sends 'a cooling card' for all fond lovers' to his over-passionate friend Philautus, and more especially in the second part he keeps up a running comment on the events of the story in his attacks upon the gentle passion and his warnings against the fair sex. Euphues, in short, is the Byronic hero of the sixteenth century.

The attentive reader will already have noticed in the foregoing outline certain striking points of resemblance to the 'Acolastus' story; but before considering these and others not yet mentioned, let us look a little more closely at the general construction

352 EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON.

of the novel. The first thing that strikes one is that the story consists of a series of episodes sufficiently elaborate in themselves but with very little connection to bind them together. After Euphues has been briefly introduced and brought to Naples, we suddenly find him engaged in conversation with Eubulus, who, having delivered his quantum of good counsel, 'away doth go,' like the Wall in 'Pyramus,' not to return again. Lyly briefly comments on this scene *in persona sua*, and passes abruptly to a second in which the hero, after a long soliloquy on friendship, offers his own to Philautus in a formal speech, and is as formally accepted. The next episode is the supper-party at Lucilla's house, followed by the dialogue between Euphues and his hostess on the topic of love. The whole description of these events reads unmistakably like a transcription of the scene in a play; and, indeed, not to labour a point, the further one reads the more the conviction grows upon one that 'The Anatomy of Wyt' is to a large extent nothing but an old play cast into narrative form. It may be objected to this that, since the conventional literary form of the age was drama, and since, as later events proved, the genius of Lyly was essentially dramatic, it is not surprising that the first experiment in a new type of literature should show signs of the influence of the drama. This is very true, but it does not go far enough; for indeed it would be equally surprising in an age when no writer ever created a plot if he could steal it, to find that Lyly had not taken his story from some previous source, and, moreover, since drama was the prevailing

EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON. 353

literature of the time, a dramatic source. As it happens, however, there is really no doubt upon the matter, for there is a small peculiarity in Lyly's novel which can only be explained by supposing that he was recasting dramatic material. The peculiarity is that we frequently do not learn the name of a character until some time after he or she has been introduced into the story, and that even then it only comes out quite by chance, as it were, in conversation. For example, the name of Eubulus appears for the first time quite casually in the reply of Euphues to his advice, and we are told Lucilla's name in the same way in the middle of the supper-party scene. This, which seems so strange in a novel, would be perfectly natural in a play, where the names of the characters are given first at the head of each scene, and are then printed continuously throughout in the margin, as each speaks in his turn. Lyly quite evidently felt the lack of these marginal aids to lucidity, for in a long conversation he often found it difficult to indicate exactly who was speaking at any given moment. If, for example, it happened to be Euphues and Lucilla, he solved the problem by writing 'sayd she' or 'quod he' in parentheses, but occasionally he forgot to do this, and we are left no clue whatever to the speaker's personality.¹

'The Anatomy of Wyt' was entered in the Stationers' Registers as 'compiled,' and there is no doubt upon the present writer's mind that a large element of the compilation was a play belonging to the prodigal son school which has now probably been

¹ e.g., Bond's 'Lyly,' I., p. 225.

lost. It is not maintained here that Lyly went back to 'Acolastus' itself. 'Acolastus' was only the parent stem of a large family, and there must have been a dozen dramas ready to Lyly's hand among which he might select. The extreme length of some of the discourses in his novel exceeds indeed anything possible in even the dreariest 'morality,' but by cutting out all the 'unnatural natural philosophy,' and the classical allusions which were, of course, Lyly's own additions, and by allowing for the circumlocution essential to the euphuistic manner of writing, the speeches are soon reduced to manageable bulk. It remains, therefore, to round off the discussion by clearing up the relations between Euphues and the prodigal.

IV.

The differences between 'Euphues' and 'Acolastus' render it extremely unlikely that Lyly made the latter the basis of his novel, though he may quite probably have carried away recollections of it from his school-boy days.¹ Since, however, we are not yet in a position to point to the actual drama from which Lyly drew his material, we are forced to go back to Acolastus, the prototype, and see how much likeness 'Euphues' still possesses to his

¹ Lyly may possibly have seen performances of the Dutch-Latin drama at Oxford. Prof. Moore Smith (p. 265, 'Fasciculus Ioanni Willis Clark dicatus, 1909') has shown that the 'Acolastus' was acted at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1560-1, and the 'Asotus' of Macropedius, an earlier prodigal son drama, at the same college, in 1565-6.

EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON. 355

alleged ancestor. The facts now to be brought forward will, I think, leave no doubt upon any candid reader's mind that our first English novel unmistakeably belongs to the numerous Prodigal Son family.

The most obvious point of resemblance of course, that indeed which first led me to think of 'Euphues' in connection with the Dutch-Latin drama, is the presence of Eubulus and Philautus. The former has been handed on practically unchanged in character. Gnapheus indeed had made him a friend of the prodigal's father, who is never brought actually into contact with the prodigal himself, though they appear together in the same scene at the final reconciliation. But it was very natural that Gnapheus' imitators should put the good counsel which the prodigal rejects into the mouth of one whose name was Eubulus. The transition was probably due to a slight misunderstanding of Gnapheus' original intentions. When he called his character Eubulus he is likely to have meant nothing more than, as has already been said, to give an embodiment to 'prudence' or 'foresight,' thus following the lines of the morality play, for *εὐβουλος* strictly means *well-advised* or *prudent*.¹ His imitators, however, substituted an active for a passive meaning, and in the 'Studentes' of Stymmelius, for example, Eubulus has become the father of the prodigal. In 'Euphues' the father has completely disappeared, and Eubulus has ceased to have any organic connection with the plot, being

¹ Gnapheus obviously took the name from Aristotle, 'Nicomachean Ethics,' book vi., c. viii.

356 EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON.

introduced for the sole purpose of administering advice, the rejection of which is the necessary and time-honoured first step in the prodigal's career of self-indulgence and disillusionment.

The character of Philautus has undergone a more fundamental, but no less natural change. With Gnapheus merely the embodiment of the prodigal's evil intentions or self-love, as time went on he became more and more alive, and eventually assumed a very important rôle in the development of the plot. In Gascoigne's 'Glasse of Government,' for example, he is one of the brace of prodigals which that play contains. He seems, in fact, to lose to a large extent his character or tempter to the hero, and becomes eventually nothing but a partner in his experiences. It must, however, be noticed that in 'The Anatomy of Wyt' he is the instrument by which Euphues is brought into contact with Lucilla, and thus he still performs unintentionally, and as it turns out greatly to his own apparent disadvantage, a task which he had originally been created to carry out deliberately.

For Lucilla is simply Lais in the costume of a lady. Though now the daughter of the chief governor of the city, her real character is continually peeping out beneath her veneer of respectability. 'Her Lilly cheeks dyed with Vermilion red,' her quite astonishing fickleness, her supper party and love of cards, and finally the 'awful end' that awaited her, all show her to be the 'meretrix' of the prodigal son story. It is her rejection of his passion that opens the euphuistic prodigal's

eyes to the iniquity of his past career and the enormity of the female sex. It should be noticed in passing how the *Lais* episode has swallowed up all other aspects of the 'riotous living' on which the prodigal wasted his substance. The only reference to the parasites is the passage already given which speaks of the companions that crowded round Euphues on his arrival at Florence; while the temptations of the table and the dice-box, which figure so largely in '*Acolastus*,' have been whittled down to a mention of a supper and a game of cards in Lucilla's house. In short the prodigality of the prodigal has been narrowed to the single element of sexual passion, and that in its turn has been purged of its grosser traditions, and become the perfectly respectable, though, in view of the prior claims of *Philautus*, not quite honourable, love of a gentleman for a lady. It would be interesting to know whether Llyl was himself responsible for this change, or whether he received it from others; for this shifting of scene from the tavern to the drawing-room was a very important one in the history of our literature.

Turning lastly to the hero himself, it may well be asked what possible connecting link there can be between Euphues, the refined wit, and *Acolastus*, the sensual simpleton. Indeed Llyl himself seems to challenge comparison between his hero and the prodigal. 'If,' he writes in his dedicatory epistle, 'the first sight of Euphues shal seeme to light to be read of the wise, or to foolish to be regarded of the learned, they ought not to imparte it to the iniquitie of the author, but to the necessity of the

358 EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON.

history. Euphues beginneth with loue as allured by wyt, but endeth not with lust as bereft of wise-dome. He woeth women prouoked by youth, but weddeth not himselfe to wantonnesse as priked by pleasure.' Moreover, as we have seen, Lylly is careful to point out that his hero was most cautious in the selection of his friends. Yet in spite of this, the original type, and perhaps the very words of the play which Lylly used, break through the new conception upon at least two occasions. One is at the beginning of the story, where Lylly, speaking of the departure of Euphues from Athens, declares that his hero 'hauing the bridle in hys owne handes, either to use the raine or the spurre, disdayning counsayle, leauing his countrey, loathinge his olde acquaintance, . . . and leavinge the rule of reason, rashly ranne unto destruction,' while a few lines below he is said to have 'followed unbrideled affection, most pleasant for his tooth.' Such language is quite inapplicable to the character of Euphues, and is supported by nothing in the account which follows. But when Lucilla has jilted him and the scales drop from his eyes, he is made to use expressions which once more sound unsuitable to his conduct, and remind us of the prodigal: 'A foolishe Euphues why didest thou leaue Athens the nourse of wis-dome, to inhabite Naples the nourisher of wantonnesse? Had it not bene better for thee to haue eaten salt with the Philosophers in Greece, then sugar with the courtiers of Italy? But behold the course of youth which alwayes inclyneth to pleasure, I forsooke mine olde companions to search for new friends, I rejected the graue and fatherly counsayle

of Eubulus, to follow the braine-sicke humor of my owne will. I addicted myselfe wholy to the seruice of women to spende my lyfe on the lappes of Ladyes, my landes on the maintenance of brauerie, my witte in the vanities of idle sonnets.' Lylly, in short, or the forgotten dramatist from whom he took his material, has, if I may use the expression, *intellectualized* the prodigal son story. The temptations that beset the hero are no longer those of the flesh, but of the intellect, or, as Lylly would himself express it, of the wit. It is wit that 'allures' Euphues to love. It is his wit that attracts Lucilla to his person. Finally, it is wit, mellowed by experience into wisdom, that is the fruit of his frustrated passion.

Yet, as just noted, Lylly cannot altogether forget the original in the new creation, and indeed the career of Euphues is exactly similar to that of Acolastus, only it is on a different plane. Both are young men who leave their native land, and come to a city full of temptations. Both reject with scorn the professed advice of their elders. Both throw themselves into the pleasures of life, and give way to their passions. Both are brought to their senses by a rude shock of awaking which with Acolastus attacks the stomach and with Euphues the heart. Finally, both bitterly repent of their folly and return in sorrow, the prodigal to his father and the wit to his university. But while reconciliation and a new life is possible to Acolastus, the experiences of Euphues have made life seem hollow and love a mockery; and throughout the second part of his history, he is represented as a

360 EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON.

supercilious misanthrope who eventually retires to a life of meditation in a cave. In making love the central theme of his book, in raising the action of the whole from a physical to an intellectual plane, in converting the repentance of the prodigal into the misanthropy of a philosopher, Llyl struck out three paths of great importance. How great we cannot discuss here. Suffice it to say that in the hands of genius the puppet Euphues became Hamlet, while his bitterness and disillusionment strike for perhaps the first time in modern literature that note of *Weltschmerz*, which was to form so large an element of the romantic spirit.

To sum up: the main contention of this paper is that the real origin of the most famous novel of the Elizabethan period is to be sought, not in Guevara's 'Diall of Princes,' though it is possible that Llyl owed something to that source, but to a school of dramas dealing with the story of the prodigal son, of which the 'Acolastus' of Gnapheus was the most famous example. Of late years students have been busy in assessing the debt which the Elizabethans owed to Italy, to France, to Spain, and to Germany. Too little attention has been paid in this respect to the Netherlands, the home of Erasmus, the birthplace of liberty, and the rival of Italy herself for the position of standard-bearer of civilization. How close was the connection between England and the Low Countries in the sixteenth century may be seen by the number of English books that were printed at Antwerp, Middleburgh, and other Dutch towns. And in regard to the matter in hand, the influence of the

EUPHUES AND THE PRODIGAL SON. 361

Dutch Latin drama which Professor Herford has found in Gascoigne, and the foregoing argument has proved to exist in 'Euphues,' is likely to be discovered in many other writers also. To take but one example: the four so-called autobiographical novels of Robert Greene, that is to say, 'A Mourning Garment,' 'Never too Late,' 'Francesco's Fortunes,' and 'A Groatsworth of Wit,' are one and all variations upon the prodigal son theme. The proof of this and its bearing upon the vexed question of the autobiographical element in Greene's writings cannot be discussed here. Nor can we do more than allude to the new light which these and kindred discoveries must inevitably shed upon certain of Shakespeare's dramas. Enough has been said to show the importance of the matter and to claim the interest if not the veneration of posterity for that old schoolmaster at the Hague who first succeeded in combining the Terentian comedy with the most famous parable of the New Testament. 'Acolastus' deserves to be remembered for its artistic merits alone. As the basis of 'Euphues' and Greene's repentant pamphlets, as the forerunner of Jacques and Hamlet, it can surely never again be forgotten by the lovers of English literature.

JOHN DOVER WILSON.

THE CARE OF BOOKS IN EARLY IRISH MONASTERIES.

DURING the past fifty years much has been written about the learning and artistic skill of the monks of early Ireland. The evidence of this culture consists of records of the learning of particular Irishmen from the sixth to the ninth centuries, of the relics of their skill, and of the attraction Ireland had at this time for English students. The English crowded the Irish schools, although the Canterbury school was not full.¹ The city of Armagh was divided into three sections, one being called Trian-Saxon, the Saxon's third, from the great number of Saxon students living there.² Bede's account of the visits of Englishmen to Ireland, and of the willingness of the Irish to receive, feed, and lend them books is too well known for quotation here.

In some respects the evidence of book-culture in Ireland in these early centuries is inconsistent. The well-known quarrel over the *Cathach Psalter*, and the great esteem in which scribes were held, suggest that books were very scarce; and the practice of enshrining them in cumdachs, or book-covers, points to the same conclusion. On the

¹ Hyde, 'Lit. Hist. of Ireland,' 221.

² Joyce, 'Short Hist. of Ireland,' 165.

other hand Bede's statement that the Irish had enough books to lend English students by no means indicates a scarcity of them; nor does the fact that the 'Annals of the Four Masters' record the deaths of as many as sixty-one eminent scribes, forty of whom belong to the eighth century.¹ In some of the monasteries a special room for books was provided, for the 'Annals of Tigernach' refer to the house of manuscripts²; an apartment of this kind is particularly mentioned as being saved from the flames when Armagh monastery was burned (1020). Another fact suggesting an abundance of books was the appointment of a librarian,³ which sometimes took place. Although a special book-room and officer are only to be met with much later than the best age of Irish monachism, yet we may reasonably assume them to be the natural culmination of an old and established practice of making and using books.

Such statements, however, are not necessarily contradictory. Manuscripts over which the cleverest scribes and illuminators had spent much time and pains would be jealously preserved in shrines; still, when we remember how many precious fruits of the past must have perished, the number of beautiful Irish manuscripts still extant goes to prove that even books of this character existed in fair numbers. 'Workaday' copies of books would be made as

¹ Hyde, 'Lit. Hist. of Ireland,' 220; Stokes, 'Early Christian Art,' 10.

² *Tech-screptra; domus scripturarum.*

³ *Leabhar coimedach.* Reeves' Adamnan's 'Vita Columbæ,' 359 note m.; cited in Joyce, 'Social Hist. of Ireland,' i. 486.

well, maybe in comparatively large numbers, and these no doubt would be used very freely. Besides books properly so called, the religious used waxed tablets of wood, which might be confounded with books, and were indeed books in which the fugitive pieces of the time were written. A story about St. Ciaran tells us that he wrote on waxed tablets, which are called in one place 'pólaire-Chiarain' (Ciaran's tablets), while in two other places the whole collection of tablets is called 'leabhar,' *i.e.*, a book.¹ Considering all things Bede was without doubt quite correct in saying the Irish had enough books to lend to foreign students.

We know little of the library economy of the early Irish—if, indeed, such a term may be applied at all in connexion with their use of books. But fortunately relics of two of their means of preserving books survive—satchels and cumdachs.

They used satchels or wallets to carry their books about with them. We are told Patrick once met a party of clerics, accompanied by gillies, with books in their girdles; and he gave them the hide he had sat and slept on for twenty years to make a wallet.² Columba is said to have made satchels.

¹ Joyce, 'Soc. Hist. of Ireland,' i. 483. Adamnan mentions them: 'At vero hoc audiens Colcius tempus et horam in tabula describens.'—'Vita Columbae,' 66. Columba is said to have blessed one hundred pólaires ('Leabhar Breac,' fol. 16-60). The boy Benen, who followed Patrick, bore on his back tablets (*folaire*, corrupt for *pólaire*), 'Tripartite Life,' 47. Patrick gave to Fiacc a case containing a tablet, *ib.* 344. Slates and pencils were also in use for temporary purposes.—Joyce, 'Soc. Hist.,' i. 483.

² 'Tripartite Life,' 75. The terms used for satchels are *sacculi* (Lat.) and *tiag*, or *tiag liubhair* or *teig liubair* (Ir.). There has been some confusion between *pólaire* and *tiag*, the former being

When these satchels were not carried they were hung upon pegs driven into the wall of the monastery chamber. One story in Adamnan's 'Life of Columba' tells us that on the death of a scholar and book-miser named Longarad, whose person and books had been cursed by Columba, all the book-satchels in Ireland slipped off their pegs.

A modern writer visiting the Abyssinian convent of Souriani has seen a room which, when we remember the connection between Egyptian and Celtic monachism, we cannot help thinking must closely resemble an ancient Irish cell.¹ In the room the disposition of the manuscripts was very original. 'A wooden shelf was carried in the Egyptian style round the walls, at the height of the top of the door. . . . Underneath the shelf various long wooden pegs projected from the wall; they were each about a foot and a half long, and on them hung the Abyssinian manuscripts, of which this curious library was entirely composed. The books of Abyssinia are bound in the usual way, sometimes in red leather, and sometimes in wooden boards, which are occasionally elaborately carved in rude and coarse devices: they are then enclosed in a

regarded as a leather case for a single book, the latter a satchel for several books. This distinction is made in connection with the ancient Irish life of Columba, which is therefore made to read that the saint used to make *cases* and *satchels* for books. See Adamnan, 'Vita Columbæ,' Reeves' ed., 115. Cf. Petrie, 'Round Towers,' 336-7. But Dr. Whitley Stokes makes *pblaire* or *pblire*, or the corruption *folaire*, derive from *pugillares* = writing tablets. See 'Tripartite Life,' cliii. and 655. This interpretation of the word gives us the much more likely reading that Columba made *tablets* and *satchels* for books.

¹ Curzon, 'Monasteries of the Levant,' 66.

case tied up with leathern thongs; to this case is attached a strap for the convenience of carrying the volume over the shoulders, and by these straps the books were hung to the wooden pegs, three or four on a peg, or more if the books were small: their usual size was that of a small, very thick quarto. The appearance of the room, fitted up in this style, together with the presence of long staves, such as the monks of all the oriental churches lean upon at the time of prayer, resembled less a library than a barrack or guard-room, where the soldiers had hung their knapsacks and cartridge boxes against the wall.'

The few old satchels which are extant are black with age, and the characteristic decoration of diagonal lines and interlaced markings is nearly worn away. Three of them are preserved in England and Ireland: those of the Book of Armagh, in Trinity College, Dublin, of the Irish missal, in Corpus Christi, Cambridge, and of St. Moedoc's Reliquary, in the museum of the Royal Irish Academy. The Cambridge wallet is decorated with diagonal lines and circles; leather straps are fixed to it, by which it was slung round the neck. The Armagh wallet is made of one piece of leather, folded to form a case a foot long, a little more than a foot broad, and two-and-a-half inches thick. The Book of Armagh does not fit it properly. Interlaced work and zoömorphs decorate the leather. Remains of rough straps are still attached to the sides.

The second special feature of Irish book-economy was the preservation of manuscripts in cumdachs,

or rectangular boxes, made just large enough for the manuscripts they are intended to enshrine. As in the case of the wallet, the cumdach was not peculiar to Ireland, although the finest examples which have come down to us were made in that country.¹ They are referred to several times in early Irish annals. Bishop Assicus is said to have made quadrangular book-covers in honour of Patrick.² In the 'Annals of the Four Masters' is recorded, under the year 937, a reference to the cumdach of the Book of Armagh. 'Canoin Phadraig was covered by Donchadh, son of Flann, king of Ireland.' In 1006 the 'Annals' note that the Book of Kells—'the Great Gospel of Columb Cille was stolen at night from the western erdomh of the Great Church of Ceannanus. This was the principal relic of the western world, on account of its singular cover; and it was found after twenty nights and two months, its gold having been stolen

¹ Mr. Allen, in his admirable volume on 'Celtic Art,' p. 208, says cumdachs were peculiar to Ireland. But they were made and used elsewhere, and were variously known as *capsæ, librorum coopertoria* (e.g. *librorum coopertoria, quædam horam nuda, quædam vero alia auro atque argento gemmisque pretiosis circumiecta.*—'Acta SS.', Aug., tom. iii., p. 659c), and *thecæ*. Some of these cases were no doubt as beautifully decorated as the Irish cumdachs. William of Malmesbury asserts that twenty pounds and sixty marks of gold were used to make the *coopertoria librorum Evangelii* for King Ina's chapel. At the Abbey of St. Riquier was an 'Evangelium auro Scriptum unum, cum capsa argentea gemmis et lapidibus fabricata. Aliæ capsæ evangeliorum duæ ex auro et argento paratæ.'—Maitland, 'Dark Ages,' 212. In 1295 St. Paul's Cathedral possessed a copy of the Gospels in a case (*capsæ*) adorned with gilding and reliques.—Putnam, 'Books and their Makers,' i. 105-6.

² *Leborchometa chethrochori, and bibliothecæ quadratae.*—'Tripartite Life,' 96 and 313.

off it, and a sod over it.'¹ These cumdachs are now lost; so also is the jewelled case of the Gospels of St. Arnoul at Metz, and that belonging to the Book of Durrow.

By good hap, several cumdachs of the greatest interest and importance are still preserved for our inspection. One of them, the Silver Shrine of St. Patrick's Gospels—which, by the way, did not belong to Patrick—is a very peculiar case. It consists of three covers: the first, or inner, is of yew, and was perhaps made in the fifth century; the second, of copper, silver-plated, is of later make; and the third, or outermost, is of silver, and was probably made in the fourteenth century. The cumdach of the Stowe Missal (1023) is a much more beautiful example. It is of oak, covered with plates of silver. The lower or more ancient side bears a cross within a rectangular frame. In the centre of the cross is a crystal set in an oval frame. The decoration of the four panels consists of metal plates, the ornament being a chequer-work of squares and triangles. The lid has a similar cross and frame, but the cross is set with pearls and metal bosses, a crystal in the centre, and a large jewel at each end of the cross. The panels consist of silver-gilt plates embellished with figures of saints. The sides, which are decorated with enamelled bosses and open-work designs, are imperfect. On the box are inscriptions in Irish, such as the following: 'Pray for Dunchad, descendant of Taccan, of the family of Cluain, who made this'; 'A blessing of God on every soul according to its merit'; 'Pray

¹ Stokes, 'Early Christian Art,' 90.

for Donchadh, son of Brian, for the King of Ireland'; 'And for Macc Raith, descendant of Donnchad, for the King of Cashel.'¹ Other cumdachs are those in the Royal Irish Academy, for Molaise's Gospels (c. 1001-25), for Columba's Psalter (1084), and those in Trinity College, Dublin, for Dimma's book (1150), and for the Book of St. Moling. There are also the cumdachs for Cairnech's Calendar and of Caillen; the library of St. Gall possesses still one more silver cumdach, which is probably Irish.

These are the earliest relics we have of what was undoubtedly an old and established method of enshrinng books, going back as far as Patrick's time, if it be correct that Bishop Assicus made them, or if the first case of the Silver Shrine is as old as it is believed to be. It is natural to make a beautiful covering for a book which is both beautiful and sacred. All the volumes upon which the Irish artist lavished his talent were invested with sacred attributes. Chroniclers would have us believe they were sometimes miraculously produced. In the life of Cronan² is a story telling how an expert scribe named Dimma copied the four Gospels. Dimma could only devote a day to the task, whereupon Cronan bade him begin at once and continue until sunset. But the sun did not set for forty days, and by that time the copy was finished. The manuscript written for Cronan is possibly the book of Dimma, which bears the inscription: 'It is

¹ Stokes, *op. cit.*, 92-3.

² 'Acta SS.', *Vita Cronani*, ap. iii., p. 581c.

finished. A prayer for Dimma, who wrote it for God, and a blessing.'

It was believed such books could not be injured. St. Ciarnan's copy of the Gospels fell into a lake, but was uninjured; St. Cronan's copy fell into Loch Cre, and remained under water forty days without injury; even fire could not harm St. Cainnech's case of books.² Nor is it surprising they should be looked upon as sacred. The scribes and illuminators who took such loving care to make their work perfect, and the craftsmen who wrought beautiful shrines for the books so made, were animated with the feeling and spirit which impels men to erect beautiful churches to testify to the glory of their Creator. As Dimma says, they 'wrote them for God.'

ERNEST A. SAVAGE.

¹ 'Finit. Oroit do Dimmu rod scrib pro Deo et benedictione.' At the end of the Gospel of St. John there is: 'Finit. Amen ✠ Dimma Macc Nathi ✠.'—Healy, 'Ireland's Anc. Schools,' 524.

² Other instances are cited in Adamnan's 'Vita Col.,' Reeves' ed., 114-18.

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

JN the latest 'Jean-Christophe,' as his admirers now call these eagerly expected volumes, Romain Rolland continues the narrative of his hero's adventures in Paris. The volume contains the history of Jean-Christophe's friendship with a young Frenchman, and a friendship between men of different races, the Teuton and the Latin, affords opportunity for interesting mental situations. Rolland gives us here the same penetrating analytical criticism of contemporary France as in the two former Paris volumes. Some very striking pages deal with the real France and with the France of foreigners who know it only from its novels and plays, its boulevard life, the intrigues of its politicians, and who do not realize that there are in France, even in Paris, women who never read novels, young girls who have never been inside a theatre, men who have never taken any part in politics. Among the poorer people in Paris, and in the provinces, are innumerable serious-minded men and women whose life is a continual self-sacrifice, a great-souled people, leading retired, commonplace lives, without apparent influence on events, but who, in spite of their silence, actually form the main strength of France. Those of us who do not derive our knowledge of France solely

372 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

from contemporary novels and plays, recognize the truth of Rolland's statements. The misfortune lies in the fact that these people cannot make themselves heard; they are too much oppressed by the necessity for hard work, by the struggle with poverty, while the newspapers, magazines, and theatres are all, so to speak, in the hands of the enemy. Now the press shuns thought, or only admits it if it is the weapon of a party. Editors commission articles from their contributors on any and every subject, regardless of their special bent or knowledge; indeed, quite often a point is made of never asking of them what they can do best; if the contributor is a poet, he is asked to write prose—probably criticisms of historical or scientific books; if he knows a great deal about music, he is asked to write on painting. It is evident that he can not write his best on those subjects, but that makes no matter: he is only required to write what common-place readers will understand.

The two friends lived in one of those huge barracks which form the homes of Parisians of the lower middle class, and Jean-Christophe manages to get on friendly terms with all the various 'locataires.' A good many things happen, things big and things little, much as they happen in life. The effect of these events on the lives and thoughts of the two friends, who talk together in the most natural way on every conceivable subject, is marvellously portrayed, and indeed it is all so interesting that I hope M. Rolland will give us another six volumes at least.

The attempt of M. Anatole France to treat as serious history the old nursery tales is most diverting. It is entitled 'Les sept femmes de la Barbe-Bleue et autres Contes merveilleux.' He treats the legends as if they were authentic history, and retells them by the light of modern research. For example, Blue Beard's conduct when studied from authentic documents, is found to be absolutely upright, and the strange opinions that have for so long found credence have no foundation in fact. He is completely white-washed by his latest historian, and the fault shown to lie with the women he married. Incidentally the historian compares Blue Beard with Tiberius and Macbeth, both of whom he declares to be much maligned by historians and poets; they were actually virtuous and gentle. It is also pointed out how a certain school of comparative mythology makes out Blue Beard to be a personification of the sun; his seven wives are 'sept aurores,' and his two brothers-in-law the twilights of morning and evening. Even Napoleon, we are reminded, is a solar myth to some historians. 'L'Histoire de la duchesse de Cigogne et de M. de Boulingrin qui dormirent cent ans en compagnie de la Belle-au-bois-dormant' is, of course, the familiar story of the Sleeping Beauty related by two personages of the court, and 'La Chemise' is that of the king, who to be cured of his melancholy must wear the shirt of a happy man, and how the man when found had no shirt. A serious, weighty, historical manner is maintained throughout, and the volume forms delightful reading. Anatole France, as we gather from his more recent

books, has little sympathy with the dry-as-dust historians, and perhaps intends this work as a gentle satire on their labours.

It is a pleasant change to read a novel dealing with the relations of husband and wife in which the breaking of the seventh commandment has no part. Marcel Prévost's latest story, 'Pierre et Thérèse,' turns on a husband with a past, in which he was the accomplice of a forger. At the time of his marriage with Thérèse, the daughter of a wealthy merchant of the upper middle class, he had made a fortune, and filled a great position in the industrial world. He did not confess to his future wife his complicity in a crime which had never been discovered. But rumours were abroad even before the marriage, on the very eve of which Thérèse questions Pierre concerning certain anonymous letters received by her father. He confesses the truth of some statements contained in them about his mother, concerning matters which being past and done with he had not deemed it necessary to mention, and Thérèse's doubts and fears are set at rest. After the marriage, however, enemies, of whom rich and successful men like Pierre have a good number, continually bring mysterious accusations against him, and when one of them determines to rake up and expose the whole business, it becomes necessary for Pierre to make a full confession to his wife. The interest of the novel lies in Thérèse's struggle between her love for her husband and her natural probity of soul. In the end love conquers, and the documents proving her husband's guilt coming by chance into her

hands she destroys them. The story is wonderfully vivid, and written with all the point and vivacity of which *Prévost* at his best is capable.

It is perhaps somewhat late to draw attention to a novel by Louis Estang, '*L'Affaire Nell*', as it appeared about a year ago. But it chances only to have just come my way, and it is so interesting and well written, that my readers may like to hear of it. Its subject is the law and lawyers, and much light is thrown on methods of legal procedure in France. All kinds of members of the legal profession march across the pages of the story. We assist at trials and at sittings in chambers, and at the interviews of clients with their solicitors or counsel. The '*affaire*' in question is a will case. A wealthy elderly man marries as his second wife a beautiful young woman, and dies a few months after. He leaves his money to her. But he has a worthless son by his first marriage, who takes exception to the will and proceeds against his step-mother. Then the lawyers on each side, who would all like a portion of the money for themselves, become involved in labyrinthine intrigues. Finally the money is lost through the failure of the bank in which it had been deposited pending the decision of the courts. Such novels as this, and '*Pierre and Thérèse*' mentioned above, are distinctly refreshing in that they get away from the usual plot, of which we are beginning to be a little tired.

Léon Frapié still sings the poor. The short stories in '*M'Ame Préciat*' (there is, of course, nothing on the title-page to show it is not one long story) make the impression that sentiment in

connection with the proletariat is being ridden to death, and that something in this continual 'pity' of the better-off for the poor does not ring quite true. There is, however, one pleasing story of some little children in an 'école maternelle,' children between three and six years of age, to whom the teacher is giving a lesson on the lamb. She draws a landscape on the black-board, puts sheep and lambs, etc., in it, and just as she has told the children that the lamb will have to be killed, is called away for a moment. On her return she finds the black-board barricaded by the children, and on asking the reason is told, 'Nous voulons pas, nous, qu'on tue le petit agneau.'

The career of Fréron's son, 'Journaliste, sans-Culotte et Thermidorien' was certainly a strange one, and those interested in such human anomalies may study him in Raoul Arnaud's 'Le fils de Fréron 1754-1802, d'après des documents inédits.' Fréron was the foe of Voltaire and the encyclopédistes, while his son could never fix his choice among the opinions of men. He served and denied all causes, betrayed his friends, and contradicted himself without knowing why he did so.

Madame du Barry's fascination is immortal, and a new book about her always welcome. Claude Sainte-André bases his relation of her career on authentic documents, and uses as motto these words of Bourget, 'Le roman n'est que de la petite histoire probable ; l'histoire c'est du grand roman vrai et porté sans cesse à sa suprême puissance.' Mme. du Barry's life certainly surpasses any fiction in interest, but to have all its force, any account of

her should be true. The author of this volume, then, supplies the truth hitherto lacking, or at least claims to do so. Pierre de Nolhac contributes a preface.

In 'La Carrière d'un favori, Jacques d'Albon de Saint-André, Maréchal de France (1512-62)', Lucien Romier traces the history of a remarkable personage, whose career has not heretofore formed the subject of a special volume. The study of his life undoubtedly throws fresh light on important historical facts, such as the opposition under Francis I., the policy and the wars of Henri II., the negotiations for the treaty of Câteau-Cambrésis, the origin, formation, and results of the Catholic Triumvirate, and the part played by the 'gouverneurs' in the sixteenth century. And yet d'Albon was neither a great minister nor a great party-leader, but a king's favourite, for thirty years the close friend of the dauphin Henri. He understood how to play his part, and so to make of himself something better than a mere favourite. He was a fine soldier, and carried out many military feats with signal success.

The 'Correspondance entre Victor Hugo et Paul Meurice' has a preface by Jules Claretie, and covers the years 1851-78. It is not often that a man who is himself a distinguished writer, voluntarily subordinates himself to a man of genius. But Meurice was the devoted disciple of the exiled poet, and became the champion of his interests and his fame. The letters form a valuable literary document for the nineteenth century, for in writing to Meurice Hugo was concerned neither with the public nor

378 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

with posterity. They give also an interesting insight into matters connected with the stage, since Meurice describes the rehearsal of Hugo's plays at a time, of course, when Hugo could not be present at them.

* * * * *

In June last Germany celebrated the seventieth birthday of Martin Greif, a lyric poet and a dramatist of great charm and power, whose work is not as well known in this country as it deserves. As a fitting mark of honour Greif's publishers have just issued a collected edition of his works in four volumes, the first of which contains the lyrics, the second the 'Epische Klänge und Feierstimmen,' and the third and fourth the dramas. Greif's lyrics are very beautiful, and represent especially the kind of feeling for nature which is peculiar to the German people. For his lyrical poetry generally, Greif went for his inspiration to the old Volkslieder, to Walther von der Vogelweide, to Goethe and Uhland. He finds poetry in everything, and expresses in simple, but always imaginative language, the thoughts, or rather the feelings, of everyday humanity. For Greif well knows that reflection in a song makes the song like a child with an old-looking face. If only German lyrics were not so untranslatable, I should like to give some examples. There is the beautiful lyric 'To Nature,' in which the idea is expressed that while we grow old nature remains always young and fresh, and is thus to all mortals an image of their youth; and the lyric entitled 'Alphorn,' which has been set to music, and tells of a peasant girl dwell-

ing high up on the mountain; they are so far apart in fact, but so close in heart, and the only means of communication possible to them is through his Alpine horn and her singing. But the substance is the least part of the poem, it is the manner and charm of the expression that give it value.

Greif is the author of a number of dramas, the earliest having been written in 1873, and the latest in 1899. They are essentially national, and deal chiefly with the fates of the great heroes of German history. They are not very popular on the German stage, for, alas! even in Germany there is a certain falling off in the theatre, and audiences seem to prefer dramas that represent, and rarely truly, abject and miserable lives, or lives whose sole object is the pursuit of sensual pleasure, to dramas dealing with high actions and great thoughts. He began with dramas of foreign history, such as 'Corfiz Ulfeldt, der Reichshofmeister von Dænemark,' 'Nero,' 'Marino Falieri.' Then followed love-dramas, of which the scene was also not German; 'Liebe über alles,' and 'Francesca du Rimini.' But his greatest fame as a dramatist rests on his German history plays, 'Prinz Eugen'; the Hohenstaufen trilogy, 'Heinrich der Löwe,' 'Pfalz im Rhein,' and 'Konradin'; 'Ludwig der Bayer, oder der Streit von Mühldorf,' 'Agnes Bernauer, der Engel von Augsburg,' 'Hans Sachs,' and 'General York.'

It is not possible to describe all the plays here. They are in verse, and possess the simplicity and purity of form that stamps them at once as fine

works of art. Perhaps the most attractive of them is 'Agnes Bernauer.' This beautiful, pure woman whose faithfulness in love drives her innocently to her death has often been the heroine of drama. Hebbel, Ludwig and others have chosen her, but for unity, delicacy, and truth to life, Greif's version of the legend stands first. The figure of his Agnes bears affinity to Goethe's Gretchen. It is a German 'Volkstück' in the best sense of the word. The simple outline of the story is that Albrecht, son of Duke Ernst of Bavaria marries Agnes, the beautiful daughter of the barber of Augsburg, and in Ernst's absence his father has Agnes drowned. While awaiting her death in prison Agnes writes to her husband, imploring him to pardon his father. The scene in the prison is most moving. Even her gaoler calls her a saint. She goes over again in a most pathetic soliloquy the time when Albrecht wooed her, writes him her last letter, and then sings the hymn to the Virgin, which Albrecht had composed. Good as Greif's dramas are on the stage, they can also be read with pleasure in the study, and are particularly to be recommended to young people for their wholesome tone and brave outlook on life. In that millennium when competent teachers will take the place of the specially edited school-books now in vogue, they will do well to commence operations by giving their pupils one of Greif's plays and a German dictionary.

The Franco-German War is becoming ancient history. Even the young men who took part in it are nearing the seventies. It is often said that the war and its result—the founding of the United

German Empire—had no influence on art and literature in Germany. But however that may be, the work of the poet Detlev v. Liliencron, who died last July at the age of sixty-five, was undoubtedly coloured by it.

He was born at Kiel. From his earliest boyhood he had a great desire to be a soldier, and entering the Prussian army served in it as an officer during the wars with Austria and with France. He retired soon after the peace between France and Germany, and tried his fortune in America—his mother was an American—but life in the United States was not congenial to him. Returning to his native land, he received a post in the Civil Service, which made it necessary for him to live on the Frisian island of Pellworm, and there he began to write poems.

Liliencron's military career served him well in his poems. He sang 'fierce wars and faithful loves,' and 'lyre and sword' would be a fitting title for his volumes. He set aside the superstition of the Heine quatrain, and demonstrated that other measures suited the German language. 'Poggfred,' his longest and most important poem, is in the *ottava rima*. Into 'Poggfred' the poet has put all his childhood's dreams, all the experiences of love and war of his lieutenant days—it has been said that the miniatures of the war which may be found throughout his poems will come to be one of its most interesting records—all the cares and troubles of his manhood, all his victories in art and in self-restraint. The spirit of youth that breathes in his poems is remarkable, for despite his sixty-five years

by the calendar, Liliencron never grew old. He has no affinity, as he had no sympathy with the decadent spirit, the symbolism and the affectations of many of the younger German poets. His verse is wholesome, strong, and joyous, and full of the best kind of humour. His philosophy of life is summed up in the following lines, and as I could not do them justice in translation, I venture to give them in the original :

‘Singt durch den Wald! Seid Füllen auf der Wiese!
 Geht mit dem Handwerksburschen, mit dem Jäger,
 Besteigt den Hengst, tanzt mit der braunen Lise,
 Seid meinethalb bei Bacchus Beckenschläger.
 Reist durch die Welt, sie wird zum Paradiese,
 Beelzebub dient auch als Kofferträger.
 Habt ihr im Portemorne gar drei Mark achtzig,
 Da gilt der alte Reim: Die Sache macht sich.’

The career and work of the German poet Lenz is treated by M. N. Kosanov, in an interesting volume entitled, ‘Jacob M. R. Lenz, der Dichter der Sturm- und Drangperiode. Sein Leben und seine Werke.’ The translation from the Russian is made by C. von Gutschow. Lenz, a German-Russian, who ended his days in Moscow, is one of the most important factors in the literary history of the eighteenth century. He was a friend of Goethe, who mentions him in his ‘Dichtung und Wahrheit,’ and even seems to have contemplated writing his biography. Lenz was a great admirer of Shakespeare, his works and letters abound in quotations from the English dramatist. He translated ‘Love’s Labour’s Lost’ and ‘Coriolanus’ into

German. His poetry shows a curious combination of realism and romanticism as they were understood in the storm and stress period.

Eduard Wechssler has produced an important work in 'Das Kulturproblem des Minnesangs. Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Renaissance,' the first volume of which (it is to consist of two volumes) has just appeared. The sub-title of vol. i. is 'Minnesang und Christentum.' Wechssler's standpoint is that the history of literature is at base nothing more than an excerpt from the history of the struggle about the cosmic position of man. He declares that these courtly artists showed the way that led from the subjection under which men lived in the Middle Ages, to their emancipation in the modern era, that is to the Italian renaissance. It is a very learned and minutely detailed enquiry. Incidentally there is a good account of the position of women during the period dealt with. The whole book goes to prove how close is the connection between literature and life.

* * * * *

The following recently published books deserve attention :—

Les Masques anglais. Etude sur les ballets et la vie de cour en Angleterre (1512-1640). Par Paul Reyher.

A very full and careful study dealing with both the aesthetic and the scenic sides of the masque. The volume contains useful bibliographies.

384 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

Thomas Percy, and William Shenstone. Ein Briefwechsel aus der Entstehungszeit der 'Reliques of Ancient English Poetry.' Edited, with introduction and annotations, by Dr. Hans Hecht.

The hundred and third volume of 'Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker herausgegeben von A. Brandl, E. Martin, and E. Schmidt. It contains an informing introduction, the text of the letters, and notes.

Une pastorale basque. Hélène de Constantinople. Etude historique et critique d'après des documents inédits avec textes et traduction. Par Albert Léon.

A learned work concerning a literary by-way.

Notre très vieux Paris. Tableau de l'existence des bourgeois et des marchands parisiens au XIII^e et au XIV^e Siècle. Par Henri Ramin.

A fascinating book on a little-studied phase of social history, beautifully illustrated.

Le Roman en France pendant le XIX^e Siècle. Par Eugène Gilbert.

The fifth edition of a very useful work with a hitherto unpublished chapter on the last ten years of the French novel.

La rénovation de l'empire ottoman. Affaires de Turquie. Par Paul Imbert.

A narrative of recent events in Turkey on the basis that 'tout ce qui arrivera d'heureux on de malheureux aux Ottomans sera heureux on malheureux pour la France.'

Vie de Sénèque. Par René Waltz.

Written chiefly to show the place occupied by politics in Seneca's career.

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 385

Belles du vieux temps. Par le Vicomte de Reiset.

Ladies who are 'belles d'esprit' as well as 'belles de corps' are included in this pleasantly written volume. Among them will be found Mme. du Barry, Mlle. Mars, the Princesse de Lieven, the Princesse de Lamballe, the Comtesse de Boigne, La Grande Mademoiselle, and others less known to fame.

Landeskunde von Chile. Aus dem Nachlass von Dr. med. Carl Martin.

This volume, published by the Geographical Institute of the University of Jena, has been prepared for press by Dr. Paul Stange. It is written in a fashion to appeal to all sorts and conditions of readers. It is a thorough piece of work, from observation made on the spot, and well supplied with illustrations and maps.

Herders sämmtliche Werke. Vol. 14. Edited by Bernhard Suphan.

The volume contains 'Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit.'

Aus Schleiermachers Hause. Jugenderinnerungen seines Stiefsohnes Ehrenfried v. Willich.

Interesting for the light it throws on German home life in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Bayern und die Wiederaufrichtung des deutschen Reichs. Von Prof. Dr. A. von Ruville.

Based on papers relating to Benedetti which fell into Bismarck's hands. A contribution to the founding of the German Empire in 1871.

ELIZABETH LEE.

THE SO-CALLED GUTENBERG DOCUMENTS.

(Continued from p. 287.)

XIA. [A.D. 1441]:

 A PIECE of oak which, we have been told, 'is 3 ft. in length and provided with a screw-hole; was discovered (!) in *Gutenberg's first printing-house* at Mainz in the *Hof zum Jungen*, on March 22nd, 1856, in the afternoon at 5 o'clock at the digging of a cellar 24 ft. under the ground; had done service as a press, and bore the inscription "J. MCDXLI. G."; was found among a heap of smaller and larger pieces of wood of the same kind, so that with these fragments a whole press might have been constructed; not a single piece of iron or other metal was found near them, but close by to the right eight baked, round, perforated stones (such as are sometimes found in Roman tombs), four Roman copper coins of Aug., Trajan, Marc. Aurel., besides two fragments of Roman vases of terra-sigillata. A couple of feet further on the right, Roman stones were discovered in their original situation.' Van der Linde, who tells us this and saw the objects, remarked

(‘Gutenberg,’ p. 87), ‘that it is obvious to the most superficial that in this falsification, ignorance and impudence vie with each other for mastery.’ In its favour see K. Klein (Prof. of the Grand-Ducal College of Mainz), ‘Sur Gutenberg et le fragment de sa presse, trouvé dans la maison où il a établi sa première imprimerie, Mayence, 1856,’ 8vo; also an article by Francis Fry (‘Notes and Queries,’ Sec. Series, XI. 23), who saw the ‘precious relic’ in 1860, and says that, ‘judging from the date on the beam, it must have been used in Strassburg, where Gutenberg resided in 1441. . . . The locality in which the discovery was made confirms the opinion generally held that he worked in secret’; further, an enthusiastic notice of this discovery in Madden’s ‘Lettres d’un Bibliographe,’ 5^e Série; see also Bernard, ‘Origine de l’imprimerie,’ I. 157, and Hessels, ‘Gutenberg,’ p. 58 *sqq.*

Now, it is beyond doubt that, at one time or another, a notion, resting on no authority, had become current that Gutenberg had occupied the *Hof zum Jungen*, at Mainz, and in 1825 a memorial-stone was erected there saying that he had printed there from 1443 to 1450, and afterwards, in partnership with Fust and Schoeffer, till 1455. But it is certain (1) that Gutenberg never lived in the *Hof zum Jungen*, that, therefore, he is not likely to have buried a ‘press’ or any other thing within the precincts of that house; (2) that, if he ever occupied a house at Mainz (which Dr. Schenk zu Schweinsberg seems to doubt; see ‘Festschrift,’ p. 155), it may have been the *Hof zum Hombrecht*, the use of which he may have obtained from his Frankfurt

relatives, its proprietors. These circumstances were, of course, unknown to those ingenious persons who buried so many would-be antiquities, so many feet under ground in the *Hof zum Jungen*, with the view of having them, on some suitable day, dug up for the benefit and delight of mankind. The 'relics' of this press came into the possession of Herr Heinr. Klemm, a wealthy tailor of Dresden, and is now, if I am not mistaken, in the Deutsches Buchgewerbemuseum at Leipzig.

XII. 12 January to 25 March, 1441. Johannes dictus Gensefleisch *alias* nuncupatus Gutenberg de Maguncia becomes surety to the St. Thomas Chapter of Strassburg for Joh. Karle, who borrowed 100 pounds Strassburg denarii (= about 6,000 marks) from the Chapter. The original charter on vellum, with the seals (one being Gutenberg's) is lost, but an old copy of it, written in the St. Thomas 'Salbuch,' entitled 'Registrande B' (now in the Strassburg Town-Archives), which contains copies of documents of the years 1343 to 1502, written by different hands, was found in 1717 by Prof. Jo. Geo. Scherzius, who gave some of his friends extracts from it. In 1720 Schellhorn ('Amoen. liter.' iv. 304) quoted it from a 'communication' which he had received from Marc. Anton. von Krafft, Senator of Ulm, who had taken a transcript from the Salbuch at Strassburg while on a tour. Schellhorn's note was evidently repeated in 1727 by Johannis (Scriptt. Hist. Mogunt., tom. nov., p. 456). The text was published *in extenso* for the first time in 1760 by Schoepflin ('Vindic. Typ.' No. v., from the Salbuch, 'ex

libro Salico, No. B, fol. 293a). See further Hesses, 'Gutenberg,' p. 58, and Schorbach, 'Festschrift,' p. 233, who remarks that, as the prudent Thomas-Chapter accepted Gutenberg as surety for a large sum of money, 'the latter must have been in good circumstances at the time. He was not called upon to carry out his obligations as surety, a marginal note in the Salbuch from the treasurer of the Chapter showing that the debt was repaid.'

XIII. 17 November, 1442. Johann Gutenberg borrows 80 pounds Strassburg denarii (=about 4,800 marks of the present day) from the Strassburg St. Thomas Chapter, at 5 per cent. per annum (*i.e.*, 4 librae = 240 marks), payable on St. Martin's day (the 11th November). For this loan he pledged an annuity of 10 Rhen. guilders (= about 330 marks) inherited from his uncle Joh. Leheymer, and payable to him by the town of Mainz (see above, No. VIII.) Martin Brechter, a citizen of Strassburg, was his surety. For the interesting and important sequel to this affair see below, Nos. XVII., XXII., XXIII., and XXIV.

The original on vellum, with Gutenberg's seal (the only one that seems ever to have become known), and two others (one of the Episcopal Tribunal, the other of Martin Brechter), is said to have been found shortly before 1840, by the then Librarian A. Jung, in the warehouse of the great slaughter-house, and to have been preserved in the old Strassburg Library from 1841, at latest, till 1870, when it was destroyed together with the Library. It is nowhere explained why the document, which belonged to the

St. Thomas Archives, and was at one time said to have been deposited in the library of the Strassburg Protestant Seminary, came to be deposited in the Town Library; but it is alleged to have been exhibited at the Gutenberg celebration at Strassburg in 1840. Schöpflin published the text of the document in 1760 ('Vindiciae typ.' p. 36, Doc. num. vi.), but merely from a *transcript* of it in the 'Salbuch' ('ex Libro Salico,' No. B, fol. 302b) mentioned above (No. XII.), saying, on p. 13, that Jo. Geo. Scherzius had discovered it [the transcript ?] and No. XII. in the Archives of the Chapter, and in 1717 communicated extracts from them to some of his friends; see also Schenk, in 'Festschrift,' 1900, p. 97; Hessels, 'Gutenberg,' p. 60 *sq.*, Document 10. Schorbach remarks that Gutenberg's borrowing money does not show that he was impecunious, as he may have wanted it for his work. It will be seen from Doc. No. XXIII., dated 10 April, 1461, that the pledge mentioned above seems to have been of no value to the Chapter when Gutenberg was in a state of bankruptcy.

XIV. St. Mathis day (= 24 February, according to Schorbach) 1443 to 12 March, 1444. Hans Gutenberg pays a toll on the first-named day, and a guilder on the latter date. Two entries, now only known from Wencker's 'Collectanea' (leaf 299^a in the Strassburg St. Thomas Archives: *Varia eccles. xi. fol.*), which he is said to have extracted from a 'Helbelingzollbuch' of 1442, etc., now lost. After 12 March, 1444, we lose sight of Gutenberg's whereabouts, till 17 October, 1448, when he borrowed

money at Mainz (see below, Doc. No. XVIII.), and it is assumed that he quitted Strassburg. Schorbach, however, has discovered the following two new entries (Nos. XV. and XVI.), which he places, approximately, in 1443 and the beginning of 1444, and which connect Gutenberg with Strassburg.

XV. *Circa* 1443. An entry recording the equipment of the town of Strassburg against the Armagnacs; Joh. Gutenberg's name is mentioned among the persons who had to furnish horses for the service of the town. The original entry is in the Register AA 194 (297 paper leaves), in the Strassburg Town Archives, which may be dated between 1439-44, and contains entries by various hands of the fifteenth century. Schorbach discovered it in 1891, and gives (in the *Atlas to the 'Festschrift'*) a facsimile of the rubric and the page which contains Gutenberg's name, with the remark that 'Gutenberg's property appears here among the humblest class, rated at 400-800 pounds denarii, which points to an annual income of about 1,200 to 2,400 marks of present value, so that his enterprises do not seem to have made him rich.'

XVI. 22 January, 1444. Summons of Strassburg-men capable of bearing arms against the Armagnacs. The lists of these persons are contained in the Register AA 195 (201 paper leaves) in the Strassburg Town Archives, and have been written by various persons; their date occurs on leaf 1^a: *Actum feria quarta post beate Agnetis* (= 22 Jan.) *Anno xlivij.* Gutenberg's name (discovered by the Strassburg Archivist J. Brucker before 17 January, 1882) appears on leaf 129^a among the goldsmiths,

together with Andr. Heilmann, his (former?) partner; see above, Doc. No. XI. Schorbach gives a facsimile of the heading of the list and the page containing Gutenberg's name.

XVII. 1444 to 1458. Various entries in six several account books of the Strassburg St. Thomas Stift, of the years 1444-5, 1445-6, 1449-50, 1452-3, 1456-7, 1457-8, recording the payment from St. Martin's day, 1444, till St. Martin's day (= 11 November), 1457, by Gutenberg and Martin Brechter (or Brehter), of an annual interest of 4 pounds on the 80 pounds which Gutenberg had borrowed from the Stift on 17 November, 1442 (see above, Doc. No. XIII.).

These Registers, in which three different stewards record the receipts of the Stift from Johannis day (24 June) in one year to Johannis day of the next year, are still preserved in the St. Thomas Archives (now deposited in the Town Archives) at Strassburg; those for the other years between 1443 (when the first payment must have been made) and 1458 are wanting. The sequel to these payments is stated below, under No. XXII.

In the first four Registers and that for 1457-8, Gutenberg alone is mentioned as paying, though it is nowhere stated whether he paid in person. In the Account-book for 1456-7 'Johan Güttenberg vnd Martin Brehter' are mentioned as giving (*dant*) the four pounds. Schorbach (in the *Atlas to the 'Festschrift'*) published facsimiles of the entries, and remarks, on p. 247 *sq.*, that as the payments are entered under the headings 'Thome' or 'Sant Thoman' it would seem that Gutenberg

had come to reside in the parish of St. Thomas, that is in the town, and no longer lived at St. Arbogast, near Strassburg.

XVIII. 17 October, 1448. Johann Gutenberg receives the sum of 150 gold guilders, which his relative Arnold Gelthuss zum Echtzeler borrowed for him from Reinhart Brömser and Johann Rodenstein at 5 per cent. (= $7\frac{1}{2}$ guilders) interest, to be paid half-yearly on St. Bonifacius day (5 June) and St. Barbara day (4 December). The original document is lost; but a *vidimus* copy of it on vellum, dated 23 August, 1503, is preserved in the Mainz Town Library, and proves that up to this year the debt had never been repaid; the five seals which belonged to it have disappeared. Whether Gutenberg or anyone else ever paid the interest on it is not known. Schorbach (p. 253) remarks that 'every unbiased person can see the object for which Gutenberg borrowed this money, as two years (!) afterwards his first Mainz printing-office was in full (!) operation. There can be no question, as is so often asserted, that Gutenberg was in need of anything. That his rich relative readily furnished him with money, allows us to presume that he was convinced of the practicability of Gutenberg's plans.'

XIXA. 1453. This year appears, in Arabic numerals of fifteenth century form, at the foot of the last leaf of the second volume of a copy of the 42-line Bible, which formerly belonged to the late Herr Heinrich Klemm, of Dresden, and is now, with most of his other books, in the Deutsches Buchgewerbemuseum at Leipzig. The date itself

might be considered genuine, did not various circumstances connected with it make it suspicious. Klemm had the Bible in his possession for several years; he described it three times in 1883 and 1884, and calls it a 'real unicum,' on account of miniatures (of a much later date) stuck in the volumes at sundry places. But he nowhere speaks of these Arabic numerals, though he must have known that, as 1456 was so far the earliest date we have for the Mazarine Bible, his 1453, if it were genuine, would considerably influence the history of Mainz printing, and at the same time enhance the value of his copy. His silence on this point was, therefore, highly suspicious, and the doubt is increased by the date being written quite at the bottom of the last leaf; see Hessels, 'A Bibliographical Tour,' in the 'LIBRARY,' July, 1908.

XIX. 3 July, 1453. Johann Gutenberg appears as a witness in a Notarial Instrument, in which Hans Schuchman [not Schumacher] von Seligenstadt, brother and servant of the convent of St. Clara at Mainz, relinquishes and bequeathes to it all his possessions, outstanding debts, etc., on condition that they maintain him and let him reside in the convent till his death, and that he be buried in the Church of St. Clara.

Schaab ('Gesch.' ii., 267) had in vain looked for the original of this document, and finding only a note of its contents among the papers left by Prof. Bodmann, concluded that this was another of the Professor's forgeries. But Schorbach tells us ('Festschrift,' p. 255 *sq.*) that, at the re-arrangement of

the Mainz Archives in 1883-5, the vellum original was discovered, and is now in the Mainz Town Library (Urk. St. 243a), *minus* the signature of the notary who drew it up, which, Schorbach presumes, was cut away by Bodmann, whom he also supposes to have taken this document as a basis for two of his forgeries (see above, IA., and below, XXIIb.). He has printed the text *in extenso* for the first time in 'Festschrift,' p. 254 sq.

XXA. 1455. Forged copies of the Letters of Indulgence, of 30 lines, with the date 1455. See Hessels, 'Gutenberg,' p. 165, 2^c, where a copy is mentioned as having been issued on 22 February, 1455, at Hildesheim, and another *unissued* copy, both in the possession of Herr F. Culemann, a Senator at Hannover. But both these copies are now proved to be *forggeries* (see Dziatzko, 'Beiträge zur Gutenbergfrage,' p. 72). Dziatzko somewhat sarcastically points out that I failed to detect the forgery when I saw these copies on 13 October, 1881, in Mr. Culemann's house at Hannover. I take this opportunity, therefore, of recording that I had wished to examine the two copies, especially the sold one, a little more closely, as I observed that the Latinity of the declaration of issue, filled in by the Pardoner, was incorrect, an unusual thing in the work of such Papal functionaries. But Herr Culemann would not allow me, insisting that all was right, this copy having been obtained from Edwin Tross. I confess that the numerous Gutenberg forgeries already known to me at the time ought to have put me more on my guard, but the thought of distrusting an old, venerable, kind

gentleman, never crossed my mind, and so I fell into the trap. Herr Culemann's collection, now in the Kästner Museum at Hannover, contains, besides the two copies mentioned by me, two more; they are all *lithographic* imitations, two on vellum, two on paper.

XX. Thursday, 6 November, 1455. Notarial Instrument of a lawsuit between Johann Fust and Johann Gutenberg, usually called the 'Helmasperger' Instrument, from the name of the notary who had it drawn up in his office, and whose name and notarial mark it bears.

This, the most important of all the Gutenberg documents, records the legal proceedings which had taken place on the above and some previous (unmentioned) day at Mainz, and which had apparently been commenced, on a date not stated, by Johann Fust against Johann Gutenberg, for the purpose of recovering two capital sums of money, advanced by him to Gutenberg for carrying out some work, with the interest thereon.

Judging from ordinary circumstances, the official minutes of these proceedings must, in the first instance, have been entered in a register of a Mainz law-court. But all the Mainz law-registers before 1551 are said to have perished; so that we have only this apparently authentically drawn up summary of the proceedings, written at the request of Johann Fust, in the office of the Mainz notary, Ulrich Helmasperger, who testifies to having been present on the said 6th November, 1455.

Moreover, history, so far as we know, does not mention this law-suit, from the day it is said to

have taken place in 1455, till 1541, when J. Arnold (Bergel or) Bergellanus (of Bürgel, near Frankfort o. M.), a Mainz press-corrector, alludes, in his 'Encomium chalcographiae' (Mainz, Fr. Behem, 1541), to a 'horrible' lawsuit between 'Faust' and Gutenberg, which had been brought before a 'timorous' tribunal, and was, in his time, still in the hands of the judge. We are, therefore, unable to verify any of the statements contained in the Instrument.

About the year 1600, Joh. Frid. Faust von Aschaffenburg, who pretended to descend from Joh. Fust (whom he called 'Faust'), seems to have possessed an 'original' copy of the document, and to have made a transcript of it, which latter appears to have been among his papers in 1712, and to have then been copied again by Joh. Ernest von Glauburg. Between 1600 and 1734 various authors alluded to it, or took copies of it for their MSS. collections (see Hessels, 'Gutenberg,' pp. 96, 97), all, however, from the Faust von Aschaffenburg transcript. In 1650, Jac. Mentelius in his 'De vera typographiae origine paraenesis,' p. 54, declared the instrument to be forged and fictitious. But he gives no reasons for his opinion, and we must remember that his work is an attempt to ascribe the honour of the invention to his name-sake, Mentelin, the printer of Strassburg.

Its entire text was published for the first time in 1734, by H. C. Senckenberg ('Sel. iur. et hist.' Tom. I., Francof. ad M.) apparently from 'an original.' It was again published in full from an 'original' by Joh. Dav. Köhler in 1740 ('Ehren-

Rettung Joh. Gutenbergs,' Leipzig, 1740). These two texts differ in some respects from each other, and it is possible that they were printed from two separate 'originals' supplied, perhaps, to Fust by the notary, as the latter testifies (in lines 65 and 66) that Fust had requested 'one or more copies from him.' There is, however, a strong suspicion that there never was more than one 'original,' that is the one which Köhler used, which may have been the one that was in 1600 in the possession of Joh. Fr. Faust von Aschaffenburg.

Since 1741 the text has been published several times, sometimes entire, sometimes in extract, never, however, from an original, but from transcripts, taken one after another from Faust von Aschaffenburg's transcript, or from Köhler's text. In 1881 the whereabouts of an 'original' were unknown (see Hessels, 'Gutenberg,' p. 63 *sqq.*), until Köhler's copy was discovered in 1889 in the Göttingen University Library (to which he had presented it in 1741, after the publication of his 'Ehren-Rettung') by the librarian Karl Dziatzko, who published its text again *verbatim*, with a dissertation on its contents, in 'Beiträge zur Gutenbergfrage,' Berlin, 1889, accompanied by a photographic reproduction. In 1900 Dr. Schorbach again issued a photograph of the Instrument, with a reprint of its text, and a commentary thereon, in 'Festschrift (Centralbl. für Bibl. xxiii.) zum 500 jährigen Geburtstage von J. Gutenberg.' In the same year 1900, however, K. G. Bockenheimer, a Doctor of Law and Judge of Mainz, in a treatise on the Gutenberg documents ('Gutenberg-Feier,' Mainz, 1900),

expressed the opinion that at least four of these documents, including the present one of 1455, are forgeries. But he speaks with some hesitation, and, looking at the photographic reproduction of what is called the 'original,' published by Dzitzko and Schorbach, it would seem almost impossible to accept Bockenheimer's opinion without further enquiry.

While analysing and discussing the document, I propose to give a literal translation of all its material parts, so far as the old German text is capable of being literally translated, dividing it into as many sections as the discussion may require, referring those who desire to consult the original text or a facsimile of it to Dzitzko's and Schorbach's treatises.

Part I.—Lines 1 to 22 are introductory, stating (1) the *time* (Thursday, 6 November, 1455, between eleven and twelve noon); (2) *place* (Mainz, in the large dining-room of the Barefooted Friars); (3) *object* of the present proceedings, with an allusion to a verdict (*Rechtspruch*) given [on the *first* article of Fust's claim, lines 21, 45, 47, 64] on a previous occasion; and (4) the names of the parties present on this occasion, or concerned in the proceedings, that is, the notary Ulrich Helmasperger; Jacob Fust, citizen of Mainz, as the spokesman of his brother Johan; the latter himself; witnesses who came in afterwards (see below) on behalf of Johan Gutenberg (not present); and a messenger in the service of Jacob Fust.

As regards point (3) the lines 7 to 10 make it clear that the present proceedings were a sequel to

some previous proceedings, as Jacob Fust declared (a) that between his brother Johan Fust and Johan Gutenberg a final day had been ordained and named for the 6th of November at noon, in the sitting-room of the convent; (b) for Johan Gutenberg to see and hear such oath as (c) Johan Fust had been appointed and enjoined to take, in accordance with the contents of the verdict (*Rechtspruch*, lines 9, 21, 54 and 55, 57; *Uzspruch*, l. 64) given [on the former occasion] between the two parties.

As to point (4) the lines 10-22 state—

(a) that, in order that the brethren still assembled in the sitting-room might not be disturbed, Jacob Fust sent his messenger to this room to ask whether Johan Gutenberg, or anyone on his behalf, were in the convent, so that he might attend to the business; (b) whereupon Heinr. Günther, parish priest of St. Christopher in Mainz, and Heinrich Keffler, servant, and Bechtolff von Hanau, workman of Gutenberg, came into the dining-room, and on being asked by Johan Fust what business they had there, and why they were there, and whether they had any authority of Johan Gutenberg in the matter, answered that their 'Juncher' Johan Guttenberg had sent them to hear and to see what would happen in the case; (c) Johan Fust then testified (ll. 18-20) that he would keep the [appointed] day, as he had been ordered to do; that he had expected his opponent Gutenberg before twelve o'clock, and still waited for him, but who had not complied with the affair; and (d) he now (ll. 20-22) proved himself prepared to satisfy the 'verdict' (*Rechtspruch*, l. 21) passed on the 'first article of his claim' (*Ansprach*, lines 21, 45, 47, 64) in accordance with its (the verdict's) contents, which he caused to be read from word to word, together with the 'complaint' (*Clage*, l. 22) and 'answer' as follows (l. 22).

Bockenheimer in his criticism on the document ('Gutenberg-Feier,' p. 97), asks how Fust could consider himself justified in taking the oath (which by a previous verdict he had been enjoined to swear), not in a law-court, but in the room of a monastery, and before a notary selected by himself (but not authorized for the purpose by any legal court), instead of before a properly constituted judge? On this point Schaab ('Erfind. der Buchdruckerk.' i., 170) had already remarked that at that time it was an old custom at Mainz to transact all judiciary, and even administrative public affairs in the churches and monasteries, or their surroundings.' Bockenheimer, however, replies that this was formerly the case, but not in Gutenberg's time; and that Fust had no right, either to withdraw part of the legal transaction from the court, or to demand Gutenberg's appearance in a monastery, before an unqualified officer, for the purpose of transacting legal business; that Gutenberg was, therefore, in his right when he himself 'zu den Sachen nit gefuget hett' (l. 20). Bockenheimer further shows that the notarial document contains absurdities which are contradictory to all the legal usages of the time, and comes to the conclusion that 'it was not drawn up by Helmasperger, but appears to be a forgery of the Faust family (perhaps of Joh. Fr. Faust von Aschaffenburg), who falsified history in other respects, for the purpose of injuring the memory of the inventor of printing, to the advantage of that of their reputed ancestor.'

Whatever we may think of the document, almost the only one which tells us anything of Gutenberg's

activity at Mainz, it is generally admitted that it is vague and indefinite concerning several points on which it is desirable to have more information.

Dziatzko, who occasionally saw more in the document than it contains, says (*l. c.*, pp. 21 and 22) that 'Gutenberg had been enjoined to hand in his account, but had, for various reasons, postponed or neglected to do this, so that at last Fust had been compelled to appoint the day on which Gutenberg should render it, and he himself should state on oath the amount of interest due to him.' But it is clear from the document that Gutenberg had not been ordered to render his account, and that the court, not Fust, had appointed the 6th of November, 1455, for the appearance of the two litigants (see above, *a*, *b*, *c*).

The document does not say whether Gutenberg, who did not appear on this, had absented himself likewise on the former occasion; he had 'replied' to Fust's claim, but may have done so by the mouth of some agent or representative, in the same way as he watched the present proceedings through two of his employees. Nor does the document explain the nature and extent of Fust's 'claim,' laid by him before the court on the previous occasion, and here mentioned four times, three times (ll. 21, 45, 64) with a particular allusion to its 'first article.' Nor does it say when or where the previous proceedings had taken place; nor when the business relations between Fust and Gutenberg had commenced, nor when these relations had developed into an action at law, which seems to have begun by Fust lodging a complaint against Gutenberg before the Mainz

tribunal (see below, p. 407). But we shall see presently that three sums of interest claimed by Fust from Gutenberg enable us to fix, at least approximately, the date when the financial relations between the two had commenced; also when Fust advanced a second sum of money to Gutenberg; when the dispute between them must have been brought before the court, and likewise the interval that had elapsed between the present and the former legal transactions.

II.—Lines 22 to 54 are the protocol or minutes of the *previous* proceedings, and of the verdict then obtained by Johann Fust. Of this part the lines 22 to 37 give a summary of the claim which Fust professed to have against Gutenberg; the latter's reply is contained in the lines 37 to 47; and the verdict given on that occasion in the lines 48 to 54.

These minutes of the pleadings of the plaintiff and defendant say—

(1) Fust had spoken to Gutenberg, first, as to what had been included in the schedule of their agreement, that he had furnished Gutenberg with 800 guilders in gold wherewith he should 'finish' the work'; (2) he himself being unconcerned whether it cost more or less; (3) Gutenberg should give him for these 800 guilders 6 guilders interest on each hundred; (4) he had borrowed these 800 guilders for Gutenberg on interest, and given them to him; (5) but the latter had not been content thereby, and complained that he had not yet had the 800 guilders; (6) Fust, therefore, wishing to please Gutenberg, had furnished him with 800 guilders more than he, according to the tenor of the said schedule, had been

¹ Germ. *volnbrennen*.

obliged to him; on these additional 800 guilders he had been compelled to pay 140 guilders as interest; (7) although Gutenberg had promised in the schedule to pay him on the first 800 guilders 6 guilders interest on every hundred guilders, yet in no year had he done so; but (8) he himself had been compelled to pay this, which amounts to 250 guilders; (9) and as Gutenberg had never paid him such interest, that is these 6 guilders interest on the first 800, nor the interest on the other 800 guilders, and (10) he had been forced to borrow the said interest (*Solt*) among Christians and Jews, and (11) on this had had to give 36 guilders as interest (*Gesuch*); (12) this, together with the capital, amounts to about 2,020 [in reality 2,026] guilders, and he demands that [Gutenberg] should pay him this as his loss.

(13) To this Gutenberg had replied [lines 37 to 47]: Johann Fust should have furnished him with 800 guilders, for which money he should prepare and make his 'tools' [or *instruments*, or *apparatus*; Germ. *Gegenstände*], and should be content with this money, and might devote it to his [own] use; (14) such tools should be a pledge to Johann [Fust]; (15) Johann [Fust] should give (*geben*) him annually 300 guilders for maintenance,¹ and also furnish workmen's wages, house-rent, parchment, paper, ink, etc. (16) if then, further, they did not agree he should return him (Fust) his 800 guilders, and his tools should be free; (17) it was to be well understood that he should finish (*volnreiben*) such work with the money which he [Fust]

¹ Opinions differ as to the meaning of the German word *Kosten* of the document. Lexer's 'Mittelhochd. Wörterb.' has *price, money for a certain object; expenses; food, maintenance, etc.* In the latter sense it is taken here, as agreeing more with the tenor of the document than any other interpretation. Zedler ('Gutenberg-Forsch.' p. 64, note) seems to think that the phrase means '300 guilders for expenses, such as workmen's wages, house-rent, parchment, etc.' But the original document does not allow such an interpretation.

had lent him on his pledge, and (18) hopes that he had not been bound to him (Fust) to spend such 800 guilders on the work of the books; (19) and although it was included in the schedule that he should give him (Fust) 6 guilders as interest on every 100, yet Johannes Fust had told him that he did not desire to take such interest from him; (20) nor had these 800 guilders all, and at once, come to him, in accordance with the contents of the schedule, as he (Fust) had mentioned and pretended in the first article of his claim; (21) of the additional 800 guilders he wished to render him [Fust] an account; (22) hence he allows him (Fust) no interest (*Solt*), nor usury (*Wucher*), and hopes, therefore, not to be legally indebted to him.

The clause II¹ (line 23) shows that a written¹ agreement [Germ. *Zettel*] was made between Fust and Gutenberg [at the commencement of their relations]. This document has not come down to us, and the present notarial instrument makes only a few, mostly contradictory, allusions to it, so that we are unable to form an adequate idea as to the nature and bearing of the agreement. That it must have been somewhat loosely drawn up, is apparent when

¹ Zedler ('Centralbl.' 1907, p. 194) is of opinion that if the *Zettel* had been a legally and properly written contract, it would not have contained so many contradictions; nor would the plaintiff and defendant have been able to put such different interpretations upon its contents, and Fust, in the face of such a document, would not have exposed himself in the eyes of all sensible persons. He thinks, therefore, that the *Zettel* was merely a receipt by Gutenberg for the 800 guilders received from Fust, whereby he bound himself to pay 6 per cent. interest till repayment of the loan, and at the same time acknowledged that the tools or apparatus to be prepared for the money should be the lender's pledge, without the latter being entitled to demand full particulars of the items on which the money had been spent.

we analyse and examine the different interpretations put upon it by the two parties concerned. Before we do this let us examine the account which Fust presented to the court, in order that we may ascertain some dates to which reference will have to be made in due course.

	Guilders
(1) Fust, in compliance with the agreement, had borrowed for Gutenberg - - - - -	800
With this money the latter should 'finish the work,' but whether it cost more or less would not concern Fust.	
(2) Gutenberg not being satisfied with these 800 guilders, and complaining that he had not received all of them, Fust borrowed for him another - - - - -	800
(3) On the first 800 guilders Gutenberg had undertaken to pay Fust interest at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum, but having failed to do so, the latter had himself been compelled to pay this interest, amounting to - - - - -	250
(4) Gutenberg having likewise failed to pay the interest on the second 800 guilders, Fust had been obliged to pay this also, to the amount of	140
(5) And as Fust had been compelled to borrow the money required for these payments of interest, he had paid also interest on this interest to the amount of - - - - -	36
Fust stated the total to be 2,020 guilders, perhaps for the sake of brevity, or in order to name a round sum, but the above items make - - -	2,026

As the above interest calculations occur in a document bearing the definite date 6th November, 1455, little freedom is left to us in fixing either the *termini a quo* or the *termini ad quem*. A sum of

250 guilders accrued as interest on 800 guilders at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum, points to five years and two and a half months having elapsed since the commencement of the loan. Hence, assuming that Fust presented his claim six days before the date of the present document, that is, on Friday, the 31st October, 1455, then five years and two and a half months take us back to the - - - *15th August, 1450*¹ as the date of the commencement of the financial relations between Fust and Gutenberg.

By the same calculation, counting again backwards from the 31st October, 1455, Fust must have advanced the second 800 guilders on the - - - that is, two years and three and a half months after he had advanced the first 800 guilders, because 140 guilders interest on 800 guilders at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum points to a period of two years and eleven months having elapsed before Fust handed his claim to the court on the - - - *31st October, 1455* six days before the date of the notarial instrument, that is, the *6th November, 1455*

1st December, 1452

¹ Schorbach points out (p. 272) that the year 1450 harmonizes with the statement of the 'Cologne Chronicle' of 1499, that the art of typography saw the light in that year, and commenced with the printing of a Latin Bible.

The 31st October, 1455, here assumed as the date of Fust having handed in his claim is, of course, an arbitrarily chosen date. It could hardly be fixed much later, for a few days should be placed between the proceedings of 6th November, 1455, and the previous ones. But he may have handed it in somewhat earlier, in which case the commencement of the business relations between Fust and Gutenberg (here fixed on 15th August, 1450) must be dated back accordingly, to arrive at the proper time for the various sums of interest which Fust claimed. Yet we could hardly assume a longer interval than a few days between the proceedings of the 6th November, 1455, and those of the former occasion, because if there had been a longer delay than, say, a fortnight, Fust no doubt would have presented a supplementary claim for half a month's interest on the last day of the trial. Dziatzko suggested (*l.c.*, p. 21) a 'considerable time between the two occasions, in order to give Gutenberg time for making up his account'; but we know that he had not been ordered to do so. On p. 22 he asserts that there 'may have been an interval of several months, but not much longer, as Fust said nothing on 6th November, 1455, of a delay and subsequent further loss of interest.' And on p. 85 he asserts that the breach between Gutenberg and Fust cannot have begun later than the end of 1454. Schorbach also thinks ('Festschr.' p. 272) of an interval extending over several months, so that the first agreement between the two men may have been made in the beginning of 1450. Zedler ('Gutenberg-Forschungen,' p. 81)

concludes that Fust handed in his claim in the beginning of December, 1454, so that the contract between Gutenberg and Fust must have been drawn up in the beginning of September, 1449, and the second 800 guilders paid on the 1st January, 1452. Any long intervals, however, are incompatible with Fust's account and the fact that he mentioned no further claim for interest. The item of 36 guilders for interest on the interest left unpaid by Gutenberg causes no inconvenience, as it very nearly agrees with the above calculations. But suppose we lengthen out the interval to an almost impossible eight, nine, or ten months, even so the monetary relations between Fust and Gutenberg must have lasted for more than four and a half years, and it is calculated (Hegel, 'Chron.' xviii., Suppl., p. 94; Schorbach, 'Festschr.' p. 265) that the debt of 2,026 guilders, which Fust had so indulgently allowed to accumulate during that period, would, in our time, have had a value of between 15,000 and 16,000 marks.

The nature, scope and extent of 'the work,'¹ which Fust had expected (II¹,¹⁷) Gutenberg to 'finish' for this large sum of money borrowed by himself and advanced by him to Gutenberg, are nowhere stated. But there can be little doubt that, as is generally assumed, 'the work' here

¹ The word 'work' occurs also repeatedly in the Strassburg lawsuit of 1439, and Zedler ('Gutenberg-Forsch.' p. 71) is not the only one, nor the first, who suggests that 'Gutenberg selected from the beginning, this indefinite word for his secret art (!) in order not to arouse by a more definite expression the curiosity of uninterested people.' A somewhat strange reasoning, seeing that these indefinite words were used in a public court of justice.

alluded to meant the 'printing' of books and other literary products by means of moveable metal types, as there is question of 'tools' or 'instruments' or an 'apparatus' (*Geczuge*¹); also of 'parchment, paper, ink, etc.,' and of 'the work of the books' (II¹⁸). Schorbach, moreover, justly points out ('Festschr.' p. 271) that Johann Fust becomes known, later on, as a Mainz printer; that Heinrich Keffer and Bechtolff (Ruppel) von Hanau, both mentioned in the document, the first as Gutenberg's servant, the second as his workman, appear afterwards in history, the latter as the prototypographer of Basle, the former as a printer at Nuremberg in partnership with Johann Sensenschmid; while Peter (Schöffer) Girnsheim, one of Fust's witnesses, becomes soon afterwards known as his partner and son-in-law.

Some authors think that the business relations between Fust and Gutenberg were of a two-fold, separate nature, although the two parts were closely related to, and depended upon each other, and had been included in one and the same schedule. They say that the first agreement concerned a work for the need or good of Gutenberg; that the second regarded a common work for the need or good of both (see Schorbach, *l.c.*, p. 268 *sq.*; Dziatzko, 'Beiträge,' p. 22). Dziatzko also suggests (p. 22) that one of the most important questions is, whether Gutenberg exercised the art of printing alone (!), or from the beginning in partnership with Fust.

¹ This word also occurs in the Strassburg lawsuit of 1439, by the side of *Formes*, and in Humery's 'Reverse,' of 1468, by the side of *Formen*, *Buchstaben*, and *Instrument*.

The notarial document, however, never mentions more than one agreement. It is also clear that none of Fust's own statements, so far as they appear in the document, entitle us to assume that *he* had ever contemplated a division or separation of Gutenberg's 'work,' for the execution and completion of which he had entered into relations with him, and borrowed money for him. For he begins by saying (II 1) that he had advanced 800 guilders where-with Gutenberg should 'finish the work,' while later on (see below, III 3) he speaks of 1550 guilders borrowed by him as having 'gone on our common work,' and (III 6) of 'the work of us both.'

By these expressions Fust must have meant a 'partnership,' on behalf of which he had found the money, though, perhaps on account of the uncertain nature of Gutenberg's plans at the start, he expected Gutenberg to pay the interest on it, maybe till the work for which the partnership had been set up was 'finished.' That Fust speaks (in the lines 62 and 63) of money 'which had not gone on the work of them both,' does not seem to refer to any separate industrial undertaking on Gutenberg's part, but simply to disbursements made, perhaps, by Gutenberg for his own private purpose outside the partnership.

Gutenberg's plea, however (II 13 to 22, ll. 37 to 47), seems to show that he had meant, if not at the outset of his relations with Fust, certainly at the time of the legal proceedings, that his position towards Fust was, or should have been, of a two-fold, or perhaps threefold, nature, but that as

Fust had failed in nearly everything which he had expected him to do, he practically owed him nothing. But the agreement between him and Fust, as he interprets it looks strange. To enable Gutenberg to prepare certain 'tools' or an 'apparatus,' Fust advanced, or should have advanced him 800 guilders, stipulating at first (II 19) that he would charge 6 per cent. interest on the money, but afterwards promising to waive this point. His security¹ (the tools or apparatus) Fust would receive on some future, unnamed day, whenever Gutenberg should have manufactured them (II 14). The 800 guilders so advanced by Fust were at Gutenberg's free disposal (II 13); he could spend or employ them in any way he pleased (even redeem his two other outstanding loans or pay the annual interest on them?), provided he produced the tools which were to be a pledge for the money lent to him; [but he did not feel bound to make anything except these tools; nothing, for instance, connected with 'the work of the books' (II 18)]. In the meantime [while the tools were in the making?] Fust should give (II 15) Gutenberg, in addition an annual (!) 300 guilders for maintenance, and also furnish workmen's wages, house-rent, parchment, paper, ink, etc. [again, it seems, without any security]. If

¹ Zedler ('Centralbl.' 1907, p. 197) argues that 'Fust did not become Gutenberg's partner, as in such a case he would have insisted on receiving as pledge Gutenberg's whole printing-office (!), including his "Donatus" and "Kalendar" types.' But this is going far outside and beyond the Helmasperger instrument, or any of the other Gutenberg documents, which say nothing of a printing-office, still less of either a 'Donatus' or a 'Kalendar' type.

[when? after Fust had made for an indefinite period all these indefinite advances and sacrifices, apparently even before the 'work of the books' had begun?]¹ the two men should be unable to agree further (II¹⁶), Gutenberg, in order to retain possession of his tools, had merely to repay Fust the 800 guilders advanced by him, and the latter would have nothing more to say. But as he had not received all of the first 800 guilders, nor at once, in accordance with the schedule (II²⁰), and he *wished* to render Fust an account of the additional 800 guilders (II²¹), he allows him no interest, nor any usury, and hopes not to be legally indebted to him (II²²).

We see that Gutenberg had expected a great deal more from Fust than the latter had apparently cared to undertake or to put into the agreement drawn up at the commencement of their relations, or even to mention at the trial. The *annual gift* of 300 guilders which Gutenberg had expected for his maintenance, he had evidently never received,²

¹ The document is somewhat vague here. Zedler ('Centralbl.' 1907, p. 196) thinks that before Gutenberg had begun to print, Fust was under no further obligations to the former regarding maintenance, etc. It appears that there can be no doubt on this point, but then it seems that Zedler should admit that, at the time of the trial, Gutenberg had not yet begun to print.

² Zedler ('Gut.-Forsch.' p. 82) says that 'Fust delayed the payment of the annual 300 guilders till the necessary conditions for commencing this payment had been fulfilled, so that when the casting of the type [for B⁴²] had been finished, and Gutenberg had gone beyond the stage of experiments (!), Fust repaired his negligence and paid, early in January 1452, the second 800, wherefore we must place the beginning of the printing of B⁴² about this time.' But there is nothing to this effect, or anything

nor the additional supply of 'workmen's wages, house-rent, parchment, paper, ink, etc.' Had Fust verbally 'promised' all this? He could hardly have agreed to it in writing, as in such a case we should have expected Gutenberg to have brought an action for breach of contract against Fust, not the reverse. And if Fust had verbally 'promised' it, he must have made the fulfilment of his promise dependent on Gutenberg's complete, or at least partial discharge of his undertaking respecting the tools.

The compact between the two looks simple, but rather one-sided, and far from business-like, as all the risks and disbursements for the work would fall on Fust, while Gutenberg would have the handling of a large sum of money for an indefinite period, provided he manufactured some tools for it, and on some future day delivered them to Fust. To understand such relations we might assume the arrangement to have been an ordinary one between Fust, a master-employer, who wished to have an important work done, and Gutenberg, a skilful workman, whom the former thought fit for it, and whom, therefore, he took in his employ. Against this assumption militate the stipulation about interest to be paid by Gutenberg, and certain traditions about his superior social position. As an alterna-

like it, in the Helmasperger document. On the contrary, Fust says 'that he had furnished Gutenberg above the first 800 guilders with 800 guilders more than he, according to the tenor of the above-mentioned schedule, had been obliged to him.' He could not have said this if the 300 guilders mentioned by Gutenberg had been included in the first or in the second 800.

tive let us suppose that Fust, having had explained to him the mechanism of the tools to be made, and also the nature of 'the work' to be executed with them when ready, had been so impressed with the prospective utility and advantage of the 'work,' that he decided to risk the 800 guilders which Gutenberg seems to have conditioned for the preparation of the tools; and knowing, no doubt, that Gutenberg was unable to give him any security he asked for none, and (according to Gutenberg) would also forego all claims to interest, merely stipulating that the tools when ready should be his pledge for the capital sum.

This stipulation, be it noted, betrays some caution¹ on the part of an otherwise so generous and unsuspecting money-lender, because by taking possession of the tools he could prevent Gutenberg from seeking the assistance of other capitalists and doing the 'work' for which they had been prepared, without his co-operation or consent. On the other hand, Fust seems to have overlooked the possibility of Gutenberg breaking down or dying before he had finished the tools, in which case he would lose his money; he also appears to have forgotten that Gutenberg would not be entirely at his mercy, as by another clause in the agreement he could, when the tools were ready, before handing them over, impose further conditions on Fust, or disagree with him in some other way, and on the latter proving refractory, Gutenberg on merely repaying Fust his 800 guilders would have done with him.

¹ A somewhat similar caution we observe on the part of Humery, a later patron of Gutenberg; see below, Doc. No. XXVII.

Of a disagreement we hear nothing, and it very likely never arose, perhaps for the simple reason that Gutenberg avoided all direct strife with Fust, knowing that the repayment of 800 guilders would have been no easy matter to him. Instead of a disagreement, however, some new 'agreement' appears to have been made, as Fust on or before the 1st December, 1452, advanced 800 guilders more than he had undertaken to supply. But he (Fust) did not, as Schorbach asserts ('Festschr.' p. 269) advance the second 800 guilders for a *new work* differing from the first, and intended this time for the common profit of both him and Gutenberg, but solely, as Fust says, to please Gutenberg, who had not been satisfied with the first 800. Not a word is said at this stage or later on about the tools having been delivered by Gutenberg, which, according to the first agreement were to be a pledge for the first 800 guilders. We know that he complained of not having received the whole of the 800, or at once, at the outset. There may, therefore, have been some altercation which threatened a breach between the two partners, and Fust fearing to be left with a collection of unfinished tools may have temporarily settled matters by advancing a second 800 guilders, thereby showing also that he discerned some value in Gutenberg's work. But would Fust have advanced this second sum without securing a lien on whatever stock Gutenberg already had in hand, or might have in the future?

At this stage we again observe a difference between the two men in explaining their mutual

position. Fust says nothing of having had a different object in view with advancing the second 800 guilders; he simply advanced them because Gutenberg had not been satisfied with the first. The latter, however, repudiated all indebtedness for the first 800 guilders (except that he had to manufacture and deliver his tools for them); hoped that he had not been obliged to devote them to 'the work of the books'; was willing to render an account of the second 800; but owed no interest, no usury, in fact, nothing.

J. H. HESSELS.

ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER

SOME seven years ago the 'LIBRARY' published an article in which the writer endeavoured to show that Mrs. Gallop's application of Bacon's bilateral cipher was a work of pure imagination. This article fell into the hands of Mr. William Stone Booth, an American gentleman, who, if not perhaps a thorough-going 'Baconian,' was at least a believer in the probability of cryptic literary activity on Bacon's part. The article did at least so much good that it either raised or confirmed his doubts concerning the rationality of the various ciphers and cryptograms that have from time to time been discovered in the works of Bacon's contemporaries. He appears, however, to have been impelled by a perhaps sub-conscious conviction that cryptogram of some sort there must be, to undertake a search on his own account. He had not sought long before he found what he wanted, and a sumptuous volume of six hundred odd pages, imperial octavo, is the result.¹

¹ Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, together with some others, all of which are now for the first time deciphered and published by William Stone Booth. London, Constable; Boston and New York, Mifflin. 1909. Imp. 8vo, xii. + 631 pp. 25s. net.

There is an interesting contrast between Mrs. Gallop's work and Mr. Booth's. Mrs. Gallop claimed to have discovered a cipher depending on certain differences of type, which nobody else was able to detect. Granted the facts she alleged, there was no reasonable doubt as to their interpretation. If the cipher was there it could be read, and when read necessarily commanded belief. Unfortunately—or fortunately—it was not there. In Mr. Booth's case there is no question that the 250 acrostic or cryptic signatures of Francis Bacon and others, which he detects in a variety of works from the 'Shepherd's Calendar' to the 'Nova Solyma,' are actually there: the only possible dispute is how they got there. Upon this point Mr. Booth is perfectly frank. 'It must not be forgotten,' he writes (p. 20), 'that, though acrostics can be produced by intention, . . . the same acrostics *may* be the result of chance. It will remain for the reader to determine how far the same rare accidents may be expected to recur . . .'¹ Except in so far as the word 'rare' begs the question, this passage puts the case with perfect fairness. No doubt Mr. Booth is in his heart convinced that an unprejudiced inquiry can only result in one answer being given to the question. So am I—only the answer I expect, is probably not that anticipated

¹ Lest I be accused of misrepresentation, I will finish Mr. Booth's sentence in a note. It runs: '. . . expected to recur with a remarkably definite frequency in the same book, and in corresponding places in that book.' His examples, however, are drawn from a large variety of books, and from many different parts of them.

420 ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER.

by Mr. Booth. It appears in the course of the very reasonable chapters in which he has expounded his views on ciphers in general, that he regards the arguments formerly advanced in this place against Mrs. Gallop's claims as conclusive. I can hardly hope to convince him that, as I believe, the results of his own labour and ingenuity are no less imaginary, but at least I hope that I may be able to put my own views with as much courtesy and moderation as he has advanced his.

Now let us get at close quarters. What is the method of Mr. Booth's cipher, or hidden acrostic, as he calls it? I will describe it first in its simplest and most rigorous form, and in order to get away from any possible prejudice attaching to Mr. Booth's applications, I will select an example of my own from a remote field of literature. Let Iulius Caesar be the name to be hidden. Then the passage hiding it must begin with I and end with R, and the intermediate letters must not only include all the letters of the name in their proper order, but so arranged that if you begin with the I, proceed to the next V, then to the next L, and so on, the R at the end of 'Caesar' will bring you to the R at the end of the passage, thus 'keying' the signature. For example:

IVNIXIT LILIVM ROSA CAECo COMPRESSV AMoR

It will be evident that in this strict form at any rate the acrostic is not very likely to occur by chance. If we take at random any passage having I and R for its extreme letters, or terminals, the

probability is that it will either not contain the other necessary letters at all, or only in the wrong order, while on the other hand if we select a passage meeting all the other demands of the cipher, it does not follow that it will 'key,' as in the following case:

Is qVOQVE QVI GRACI^LI CIBVS EST IN CORPORE SVMUS
NON ALIT OFFICIO CORPVS INANE Svo
SED VIGILO VIGILENTQVE MEI SINE FINE DOLORES
QVOQVE IERIT QVAERAS QVI FVIT ANTE COLOR

where the R of 'Caesar' coincides with the R in 'quaeras,' instead of the R at the end of 'color.'

Nevertheless, it may so happen that a chance passage will contain the acrostic exactly, and have all the appearance of being intentional, as witness these four lines from the Pontine epistles of Ovid (II. ii. 69-72):

INCOLVMIS CONIVNX SVA PVLVNARIA SERVAT
PROMOVET IMPERIVM FILIVS AVSONIVM
PRAETERIT IPSE SVOS ANIMO GERMANICVS ANNOS
NEC VIGOR EST DRVSI NOBILITATE MINOR

Now the first thing I wish to observe is this, that the cipher I have just described is not properly speaking a cipher at all. Indeed, Mr. Booth himself describes it as a hidden acrostic, but he has much to say of its connection with ciphers and ciphering, and appears to have overlooked an important distinction which really serves to remove it to a totally different category. It is, he informs us (p. 21), 'a plain variant of the simple acrostic which can be seen on page 55, and is an

equally plain variant of the well-known cipher method to be seen on page 63.' The example on p. 55 is an ordinary acrostic in which the initial letters of each line of a poem spell a name. That on p. 63 is the equally familiar cipher in which the initial letters of the words (in this particular case of alternate words) form the cryptic message. What is common to, and distinctive of, these two methods, as well as every other conceivable method, of cipher or cryptic writing, is that they presuppose a key, by the knowledge of which the hidden message may be with certainty extracted. In Mr. Booth's acrostics the only key is the hidden message itself. They can, he says (p. 20), 'be produced by intention, and by exact methods which I shall exhibit,' and he fulfils his promise. But he nowhere shows us the necessary correlative, the exact methods by which the acrostic, once inserted, can be again extracted. The reason is that no such method exists; the decipherer has to rely on guess-work. Thus for purposes of correspondence, the only purpose for which Bacon and his contemporaries seriously interested themselves in such devices, these hidden acrostics are useless. Suppose that in a moment of quite unreasonable irritation I wished, while safeguarding myself from a possible action for libel, to convey to a correspondent the information that 'Mr. Booth is mad.' And suppose that for the purpose I hid my message in the following elegant sentence:

MERRILY DANCED THE COW-BOY ON THE GRAYISH-BLUE
MARKINGS OF THE VELD.

ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER. 423

Of course, I should send the sentence without any distinction of type, in the course of an ordinary letter. 'Merrily danced the cow-boy on the grayish-blue markings of the veld'! The words might be trusted to arrest my correspondent's attention, and we will suppose that he knew he had to look out for this particular acrostic cipher. Would he be able to extract my message? It is hardly likely. After puzzling over the various possibilities of cryptic words with the terminals M and D, he would probably conclude that I had sent him the valuable information that:

MERRILY DANCED THE cOW-BOY ON THE GRAYISH-BLUE
MARKINGS OF THE VELD.

'My dog barked!' And if he got so far as to discover a possible alternative reading in 'My dog is mad'—well, it might save me from the visit of an infuriated man who considered I had wasted his time with a singularly foolish joke.

Of course, Mr. Booth is perfectly aware of all this; indeed, he seems to regard the uncertain and what I may call the quasi-fortuitous character of the acrostics as a merit, enabling the cipherer, if challenged, to repudiate what he 'could say truthfully *might* be the result of chance.' The point that I wish to bring out is that the many interesting examples of ciphers which he quotes from early works, both technical and literary, and the many important passages he adduces to show the interest taken in ciphers by Bacon and his contemporaries, are all alike irrelevant, because they refer to a wholly different class of composition.

He is here at a serious disadvantage compared to Mrs. Gallop, who claimed to be applying what everyone admitted was Bacon's own peculiar cipher. Mr. Booth has nowhere shown that either Bacon or anyone of his time ever dreamed of these hidden acrostics, nor has he offered any reason for supposing that had he been able to expound his method to Bacon himself, that great man would not have brushed aside the conceit with as much impatience as lesser men are likely to do to-day.

I have above admitted that in its simplest and most rigorous form it is unlikely that the acrostic should be seriously dependent on chance. Supposing that each of the Pontine Epistles began or ended with a quatrain such as I have quoted above; or supposing that every time Virgil began a line of the 'Aeneid' with the letter A, the name 'Augustus' brought us to an S at the end of the next line, one would without hesitation pronounce the acrostics to be intentional. But the signatures discovered by Mr. Booth are far indeed from being of this simple and rigorous type. I must try to explain in some detail the methods upon which he has proceeded.

To begin with, he follows the letters of the text in which the acrostic is supposed to be concealed, not, as a rule, in the natural order as read, but as what he calls a 'string of letters,' that is, reading, say, the first line to the right, the second to the left, the third to the right again, and so on. Of course, there is no reason why the cipherer should

ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER. 425

not have adopted this method, though it undoubtedly introduced certain complications into his task, which need not be discussed here. But there is, so far as I can see, no particular virtue in this 'string' method, and if anybody likes to work out a conflicting series of acrostics by reading the letters in the habitual fashion, he will be able to claim for his results precisely the same amount of authority as Mr. Booth.

Next, Mr. Booth by no means always reads on every letter when following out his signature. As he explains, it is possible to read in many different ways. For instance, we may read on initial letters only, or on terminals (first and last letters), or on capitals. Or, discarding the 'string,' we may read on the outside letters of a page or stanza, or on the 'overhanging' (*i.e.* non-indented) initials of a poem. There is, so far as I am aware, no reason why we should not read on alternate letters, or end letters of words, or on all italic letters, or in half a dozen other different ways. Mr. Booth has recorded no acrostics constructed on these methods; probably he has not sought them: I have little doubt they could be found.

Then again, Mr. Booth's signatures by no means always, or even usually, run from the first letter of the passage to the last. They may run from the last letter of the first line of a stanza, paragraph, or page, to the first letter of the last line; from the first of the first, to the first of the last; from the last of the first, to the last of the last; from the first letter of the last word of the last line, to the first letter of the last word of the first line; from

any outside letter round the margin, and back to the letter next to that on which it started; from the initial of any line throughout the passage, and back to the initial of the next line; and in many other ways: in short, from any conceivably significant position to any other. Or two signatures (say, Francisco and Bacono) may start from different points, more or less prominent, and meet on the same letter in the body of the text. Furthermore, the signature may be spelt backwards, for it by no means follows that because an acrostic will work in one direction it will also work in the other.

Now these extensions of the method profoundly modify the part which chance may be expected to play in the result. Supposing, to take the concrete case before us, that we are searching for cryptic signatures of Bacon in the collection of plays published in 1623 with Shakespeare's name upon the title-page. We have, to begin with, a number of different names which may possibly be concealed: Bacon, Francis Bacon, Verulam, St. Albans, any of these will, of course, be good signatures. Then some latitude of spelling is to be allowed: St. Alban and St. Albans are both found in autograph letters; if Francis will not 'key,' perhaps Frauncis or Franciscus will. If any words are included in the signature beyond the actual names, the latitude in this respect will be considerably extended. Often one and the same passage will offer several possible pairs of letters sufficiently conspicuous to be used as terminals. If the signature will not 'key' reading to the right, it may reading to the

left; if not forwards, possibly backwards; if not on all letters, perhaps on terminals; and so forth. The number of alternatives open to a skilful decipherer is almost unlimited, but with every fresh alternative which is admitted as legitimate the door is opened yet wider for the element of chance. After carefully studying Mr. Booth's method, and witnessing with something like amazement the ingenuity with which he applies it; after, moreover, a good many clumsy attempts of my own to follow in his footsteps; my wonder is, not that his industry should have been rewarded by the discovery of two hundred and fifty acrostic signatures drawn from almost the whole field of what we roughly term Elizabethan literature, but rather that he should have been content to rest his case upon so comparatively moderate a number.

I have so far based my description of Mr. Booth's methods upon the account which he himself gives of them in the first part of his work. I hope that I have succeeded in avoiding any serious misrepresentation, while at the same time endeavouring to show that a far larger opening has been left for chance than Mr. Booth is apparently aware. But this is by no means all. When we come to examine the signatures themselves, we find Mr. Booth—or, of course, the cipherer—allowing himself all sorts of liberties, for which the rules set out in his chapter on method left us almost wholly unprepared. I will admit at once that I have not worked through the whole of his two hundred and fifty signatures, but I have carefully examined the first fifty, together with a few individual ones later

on. Upon these I base my further account of the methods employed.

The crux of the whole matter is the question as to when a signature can be regarded as satisfactorily 'keyed.' The practical way in which the decipherer works, if he wishes to find signatures of Francis Bacon, is to look out for a promising beginning, a conspicuous F, B, or N. He then tries a signature, Francis Bacon, Bacon, Bacono, Nocab, Nocab Sicnarf, and so on, reading to right, to left, on all letters, on terminals, on initials, etc., until he finds the last letter bringing him to some point on the page which can be regarded as conspicuous, or significant in some way or other. There are also, as we shall see later on, a number of minor ways in which the incidence of the letters can be modified. The real point, however, is the degree of prominence to be demanded of the terminals upon which the signature 'keys.' And this is just the point in which, it seems to me, Mr. Booth's methods leave a good deal to be desired.

Take such a case as that of the signature recorded on p. 570, as found in Jonson's Epigram LVI in the 1616 folio. Beginning on the initial F of the first word of the last line, Mr. Booth reads a name which he spells 'Ffrauncis Bacon,' and ends on the N in the title 'On Poet-Ape.' Not only is there nothing conspicuous about this N, but it happens to be of a rather particularly modest and retiring nature, being a small capital flanked by two large ones. In the signature which he numbers 26, again, Mr. Booth allows himself to begin on the wholly inconspicuous word 'for' in the first line of

ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER. 429

Shakespeare's 71st sonnet, for no better reason than that it contains the only F in the line. In signature 28, found in the 111th sonnet, his only excuse for ending on the equally inconspicuous F of the word 'friend,' is that it is the last F in the sonnet. Had there been another Mr. Booth would, of course, have adopted his favourite spelling 'Ffrauncis,' and been equally well satisfied. At the foot of p. 139 a signature is given which begins vaguely in the middle of a running-title. A particularly flagrant case is signature 10, occurring in a longish poem the first and last words of which begin with the letter N. Mr. Booth first draws attention to the fact that near the middle occurs what he calls a 'monogram of capitals.' The beginnings of certain lines run as follows:

But
Arte
Fortune
Was
For
By
But

and thus present Bacon's initials twice over. He then proceeds to read from the N at the beginning of the poem, on initials, spelling Nocab, and arrives at the B of the first 'But' of the monogram. Then turning to the N with which the last word of the poem begins, he again reads on initials, this time backwards, spelling Nocab, and arrives—no, he does not arrive, as he obviously should, on the B of the second 'But,' but on the wholly inconspicuous B of 'By' in the line above, which forms no part of the monogram with which he started. And yet he calmly regards the acrostic as 'keyed'! It would be easy to multiply instances of the sort, and it is really not unfair to say that any excuse is regarded as good enough for the

430 ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER.

selection of a terminal which happens to fit the acrostic. The evidential value of such signatures is, of course, absolutely nil.

There are various other liberties which the cipherer—or decipherer—has allowed himself, and which I will formulate in a series of supplementary rules, adding in each case a reference to the passage whence they are deduced.

1. When reading on terminals we have the choice, in any signature, of regarding words divided by a hyphen as either one or two (p. 36, *cf.* Nos. 5 and 12).

2. Stage directions may be included or excluded at will (p. 42), so may words within parentheses (No. 2).

3. Large initial letters may be used or disregarded according to convenience (No. 20).

4. The letters 'v' and 'u' though usually to be regarded as interchangeable, may, if convenient, be distinguished according to the modern usage (No. 31). N.B.—It is inconceivable that an Elizabethan cipherer should make this distinction.

5. We are at liberty to disregard any final -e that interferes with the acrostic, and may, for instance, 'key' a signature on the F of 'chiefe' and the N of 'owne' (No. 242, also Nos. 32, 33, etc.).

6. We may use as terminals of an acrostic any letters, however inconspicuous, provided they can be regarded as forming part of a monogram (No. 14, *cf.* No. 10).

7. We may, if convenient, include letters wholly disconnected with the text, such as printers' 'signatures' (Nos. 15 and 17).

ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER. 431

With all these licences the game really becomes too easy to be amusing. In many cases, to read Mr. Booth's acrostics is like watching a bad patience player who is continually cheating against chance.

But I have said enough now of Mr. Booth's methods and must turn to his results. Of course this cipher-work requires care, and care in plenty Mr. Booth has bestowed upon it; but it also requires knowledge and intimate acquaintance with the habits and customs of the time. In this respect the searcher's equipment should be perfect if he is to avoid the pitfalls which lie everywhere on his road. I have already mentioned a little matter of 'u' and 'v,' which will at once rouse the suspicion of anyone familiar with Elizabethan typography; but I do not wish to labour the point as it affects (I believe) only one of Mr. Booth's signatures. But there was another insignificant little flaw in his knowledge, through which, by the irony of fate, he has given his case away pretty completely. The success of a great number of Mr. Booth's acrostics depends on our spelling 'Francis' as 'ffrancis.' Now he can, of course, point to plenty of autograph signatures in which this form occurs; but these have nothing to do with the case. As every palaeographer knows, the sign which looks like 'ff,' and is usually so rendered in modern 'diplomatic' texts, did not stand for 'f f'—still less for 'Ff'—but was merely a scribal form of the majuscule F. In sixteenth and seventeenth century type F is the invariable form; 'ff' as a majuscule

is unknown; 'Ff' would be a monstrosity. So long as he continued to write it, no educated person ever regarded this 'ff' as constituting two letters, but one, and one only; and it would, therefore, have been impossible that the idea of counting the F at the beginning of Francis twice over should ever have entered into the head of an Elizabethan cipherer. It is as certain as any historical fact can be that the signatures involving the spelling 'ffrancis' were not inserted in the text during the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries.

A considerable proportion, therefore, of the signatures discovered by Mr. Booth must be ruled out as either too vague to possess evidential value, or as inconsistent with contemporary custom. When, however, all deductions have been made, we are left with a fair number of quite good acrostics, and some even startlingly good. There is a charming neatness about the signature (No. 89) in the famous lines so dear to Baconians:

But since he cannot, Reader, looke
Not on his Picture, but his booke.

'Begin to read from the initial B of the word "But"; to the right, and back on the next line; on all the letters of the words; spelling BACON, you will arrive at the initial N of the word "Not," thus keying the signature.' This acrostic also works backwards.

We thus come back to the fundamental question as to the part played by chance in the production of these acrostics. It is, of course, at bottom a mathematical question, but since the data are far

too
we
For
across
the
wh
que
evid
forg
and
tha
by
con
Bac
occ
it
a
eve
sha
larg
Bo
tog
hel

Bo
rev
If
Ad
top
the
con
On

too complicated for direct mathematical treatment, we must seek some indirect method of approach. For my own part, I naturally claim all the 'ffrancis' acrostics as demonstrably the result of chance, and these are sufficient in number to invalidate the whole structure; but as this depends on a technical question upon which I can only appeal to the evidence of experts, the ordinary reader may be forgiven if he feels a little sceptical concerning it, and I will not press the matter. I think, however, that if it can be shown that the passages selected by Mr. Booth as containing signatures of Bacon contain those of other persons as well, and that Baconian signatures similar to those he has detected occur in books printed before Bacon was born; it will have to be admitted that chance plays a considerable part in their production. I will even say that unless it is possible to do this we shall be critically bound to accept at any rate a large proportion of the acrostics published by Mr. Booth as the result not of chance, but of design, together with whatever their genuineness may be held to imply.

Now a good many of the passages cited by Mr. Booth as containing signatures of Francis Bacon reveal other names as well to a very casual inspection. If the terminals of the dedication of 'Venus and Adonis' (p. 125), read from left-bottom to right-top corner, yield the name Frauncis Bacon, read in the natural order from left-top to right-bottom corner they equally yield that of Robert Dabourn. On p. 249 Mr. Booth is extracting an elaborate

434 ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER.

signature read on capitals only, but he has neglected the heading to the page. Taking this into account and reading from the B at the left-bottom corner to the T at the right-top corner, we get the name Beamont, a variant of Francis Beaumont's signature. It would be easy to go on, for there are probably few if any of the passage cited by Mr. Booth in which a patience and ingenuity equal to his own could not find alternative signatures. But I will confine myself here to the consideration of two acrostics of special interest.

If there was one person more than another who had a passion for contributing commendatory verses on every possible occasion after the seventeenth century had attained its majority, it was the brilliant young Cambridge wit Thomas Randolph, and although he was only eighteen at the time of the original publication, it must have often occurred to readers to wonder why no lines of his were prefixed to the first, or indeed to any other, Shakespeare folio. But if we turn to the verses facing the title-page, we find his familiar initials conspicuous in the heading: 'To the Reader.' Following this hint we begin to read from this R, to the right, downwards, on initials, 'stringwise,' till the H at the end of Randolph brings us to the H at the beginning of the last words, 'his Booke.' 'T. Randolph (h)is Booke'!¹ The mystery is solved. Randolph wrote no commendatory verses because he was himself

¹ Lest this manner of reading an acrostic be thought illegitimate, I would refer to p. 246 of Mr. Booth's work, where, reading on capitals only, he allows the signature, 'NO CABSICNAR From my lodging in London,' etc.

the author of the plays in question. Truly a remarkable performance for a youth of eighteen.

I think it will be generally admitted that if the Shakespearian authorship of the plays is a myth, and the name of the true author to be revealed only by a diligent search for cryptic signatures, the one signature that must not occur is that of William Shakespeare. How do the facts stand? In the epilogue to the 'Tempest,' reproduced by Mr. Booth on p. 61, he finds the acrostic signature Francisco Bacono. It is not a good signature, because all the terminals are absolutely inconspicuous. What other acrostic does the epilogue contain? Disregarding (as Mr. Booth has taught us to do at will) the large initial N, it will be seen that the first and last couplets of the poem are indented. The initials now run: leaving the W and M in conspicuous positions. Begin on the W and read on all capitals throughout the lines, spelling Wiliam, and you arrive at the before-mentioned M. (Observe, in passing, that a perfectly insignificant 'Let' has been given a capital letter for no imaginable reason except that it was needed for the acrostic.) So far, so good; but the occurrence of the name William only serves to arouse our curiosity. Where are we to look for another clue? for a spell, in fact, that shall unbind the hidden writing, and release the author's secret? Obviously in the passage in which the poet bids you 'by your Spell, But release me from my bands'! Follow his hint, and begin to read from the S of the word 'Spell,' at the

O
A
W
.
.
M
A
L

436 ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER.

end of the eighth line, upwards (so as to escape the 'bands'), to the left, on all letters, till you have spelt the name Shakespeare, and you will arrive at the E of the word 'true' at the end of the fifth line above. Is it not perfectly evident that if you 'spell true' the acrostic here is not 'Francisco Bacono,' but 'William Shakespeare'? ¹

I will now leave the books dealt with by Mr. Booth, and turn to the first collected edition of Chaucer's works, printed in London in 1532, by a little-known printer Thomas Godfray. Prefixed to the volume is an unsigned address to the king, which runs into six columns of type. Into this address the printer has woven an elaborate acrostic. It runs from the initial T of 'To,' the first word of the heading, to the right, downwards, on all the letters, but reversing when it comes to the last line, so as to finish on the final letter of the word 'Amen' with which the address closes. The following is the remarkable statement it contains: 'These ensuing works heretofore ascribed to the industry of Master Geofrey Chaucer and now for the first time collected under his name as though by him indeed composed and imprinted in London by the care of Master Thomas Godfray this year of grace MDXXXII are in truth such as shall hereafter spring from the fertile genius of one who shall bear

¹ Lest this punning on the word 'Spell' should appear to some fantastic, let me quote one sentence from Mr. Booth (p. 144). 'As a working hypothesis I shall pay attention to the large cipher O in the monogram L^O_N; for to a man playing with the appearances of words as well as their meaning, it is possible that the words L^O_{OKE} ^{NOW} may have been chosen to mean "Looke ON Now"; also "Lo!"'

the famous honourable and never to be forgotten name of Maister or Sir Francese Bacan.' It is perhaps not strange that the prophetic cipherer should have been a little vague as to the spelling of the author's name; it may, however, be nothing more than a slip, for it is noticeable that if the cipher be read backwards the name will be found to be correctly spelt 'Nocab.' I am also encouraged in this belief by the fact that another acrostic in the same address contains the name in the usual spelling. This acrostic runs from the large initial A immediately following the heading, to the right, downwards, as before, but this time on the terminal letters of words only, to the final N of 'Amen,' and contains the following corroborative statement: 'Author of the poems and other elegant works imprinted in this volume and here by subtlety ascribed to one Chaucer clerk of London is in truth and fayth Francis Bacon.' These acrostics were, of course, the work of the printer, not the poet. Later on, however, we find a remarkable example of their combined efforts. It occurs on p. 792 (of the Oxford Press facsimile) in what is almost the last poem of Chaucer's in the volume: an envoy to the king. The lines run thus:

O conquerour of Brutes Albyon
 Which that by lyne and free elecion
 Ben very kyng this to you I [s]ende
 And ye that may all harmes amende
 Haue mynde vpon my supplycation.

The apostrophe, 'O conquerour of Brutes Albyon,' was intended by the poet as a heading, and stands

438 ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER.

outside his acrostic, which runs through the four remaining lines. Notice that the first and last of these end with N, while the middle line of the stanza begins with B. Start from this middle B and read to the right, downwards, on all the letters, spelling Bacon, and you arrive at the final N of 'supplication' at the end of the fifth line. Start again from the same middle B and read to the left, upwards, on all the letters, spelling Bacon, and you arrive at the final N of 'election' at the end of the second line. This is quite a satisfactory Baconian signature, and is obviously due to the author. The printer has, nevertheless, endeavoured to improve upon it. It will have been noticed above that I have printed the first letter of the word 'sende' in brackets. In the original it is misprinted 'f.' This, of course, at once catches the eye, and raises a suspicion. Begin to read from this F, to the left, upwards, on all the letters spelling Francisco, and you arrive at the initial O of 'O conquerour,' the words with which the stanza begins.

The volume includes near the end some memorial verses to Caxton, for whom, as his predecessor in Chaucerian printing, Godfray evidently entertained a profound respect. Well he might, for Caxton, too, was in the secret, and passed it on to his disciple Wynkyn de Worde. Both knew that the poems passing under the name of Chaucer—aye, and of Lydgate, too—were in reality—what shall we call them?—ante-natal works of Francis Bacon's. Perhaps it was a case of metempsychosis. Caxton, of course, printed the 'Canterbury Tales,' but he also printed some

of Chaucer's smaller works as separate pamphlets. Among them was 'Anelida and Arcite,' a copy of which is in the Cambridge University Library, and has been published in facsimile. It is a little disconcerting to find the first stanza containing an obvious acrostic (reading on all letters from first to last), 'Thomas Heywood authore.' But most likely the acrostic was inserted to give Bacon a means of escape if he should ever be accused of the authorship. The second stanza, however, begins with the letter F, which looks more promising. Begin to read from this F, to the right, downward, on terminals only, spelling Francisco, and you will arrive at the ligatured CO (treated together as one terminal letter) of 'corynne,' the last word of the third stanza and of the page. Now proceed to the third stanza, which conveniently begins with the letter B. Start on this B and read as before, to the right, downwards, on terminals, spelling Bacon, and you will arrive at the final N (disregarding the -e as Mr. Booth has taught us to do) of this same word 'corynne.' This is a quite satisfactory signature, Francisco Bacon; the Latin termination, as is often the case, being added to the personal name only. At the end of the volume again, immediately above the explicit, is the envoy to the king, that we have already met in Godfray's collection, and containing the same acrostic of Bacon, though as it lacks the misprint not, of course, that of Francisco.

Another of these little Caxton pamphlets preserved at Cambridge contains Lydgate's poem of the 'Churl and the Bird.' The last stanza contains

440 ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER.

an address to his 'little quire,' which he bids go humbly to his 'Master' and

Beseke hym lowly of mercy And pyte
Of thy rude makyng to haue Compassion

The 'Master' is ostensibly Chaucer, but in view of the acrostic revealed in these lines by the letters I have printed in capitals, another interpretation is obviously suggested. Yet another tract in the same collection contains Lydgate's poem, or treatise as it is called, of the 'Horse, the Sheep, and the Goose,' printed by Caxton's successor de Worde. The first stanza runs as follows:

COntreuersyes / pleas and dyscordes
¶ Bytwene personnes were two or thre
¶ Sought out the groundes by recordes
¶ This was the custome of antyquyte
¶ Iuges were sette / that hadde auctoryte
¶ The caas conceyued standyng Indyfferent
¶ Bytwene partyes to gyue Iugement

Here is something distinctly promising for our present 'controversy,' offering patient 'judgement' in a difficult 'case.' Observe that the first line—a sort of heading, 'Controversies, Pleas, and Dis-
cordes'—begins with a large initial which sets it apart from the rest, which are, moreover, linked together as it were by the use of a sort of index mark at the beginning of each. We concentrate our attention on these, and notice that the first and last begin with the word 'Bytwene,' and that this word (disregarding, as we have been taught, the final -e) begins with the letter B and ends with the letter N. Start, therefore, from the

ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER. 441

B of the first 'Bytwene,' and read to the right, downwards, on the terminals, spelling Bacon, and you will arrive at the final N of the second 'Bytwen(e).' Start again from the initial B of this second 'Bytwene,' and read to the right, upwards, on the terminals, spelling Bacon, and you will arrive at the final N of the first 'Bytwen(e).' Obviously, therefore, there is a cryptic signature of Bacon 'between' these well marked points. But this is not all. Begin once more on the B of the first 'Bytwene' and read to the right, downwards, this time on all the letters, spelling Bacon, and you will arrive at the N of the word 'antyquyte' in the middle line of the stanza. Begin again on the B of the second 'Bytwene,' and read to the right, upwards, on all the letters, spelling Bacon, and you will arrive at the same N of 'antyquyte,' thus finally keying the acrostic. Is there a better signature than this to be found in Mr. Booth's collection?

Mr. Booth admits that chance as well as design can produce these acrostics. He will, no doubt, assign those here adduced to the former agency—which is, of course, exactly what I am arguing. But if mine, why not his also? He will, I suppose, point with complacent assurance to his two hundred and fifty instances, beside my paltry half dozen. To which, however, it should be a sufficient reply that he has probably spent more months in the chase than I have hours, that in the course of my own modest search I have found quite a proportionate number, and that there is no con-

442 ANOTHER BACONIAN CIPHER.

ceivable reason why I should not go on finding them indefinitely at the same rate.

I have been told, I know not with what truth, that Mr. Booth began working out acrostic signatures of Francis Bacon in Shakespeare's plays as a joke, for the amusement merely of his private friends, that as he proceeded he became more and more astonished at the signatures he obtained, and finally ended by accepting his results in all seriousness. If so, it is a thousand pities that, before yielding his judgement captive to the supposed evidence, it did not occur to him to test the validity of his methods by the simple process I have here applied, that namely of trying whether, using the same methods, it was not equally possible to extract signatures from works with which Bacon obviously cannot have been concerned. Had such a test been honestly applied, the present volume would never have been written. I can hardly hope now to convince him of the real position of affairs, but if what I have said above should make him pause before extracting for publication—as he easily might—another and yet larger collection of acrostics—well, I shall not have wholly wasted my editor's space and my readers' patience.

W. W. GREG.

REVIEWS.

Transactions of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society.
Vol. ix., Part 1.

 HIS section of the Transactions of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society duly pays its toll to Scottish interests by articles on the 'Early Views and Plans of Edinburgh,' by Mr. William Cowan, on the 'Printed Catalogues of the Advocate's Library,' by Mr. Dickson, and on the 'Bibliography of Robert Burns (1786-96),' by Mr. J. C. Ewing, this last a very interesting paper. The rest of the part is given up almost entirely to incunabula, which form the main subject of the Presidential Address by the late Mr. J. P. Edmond, from whose pen there is also printed a brief description of his method of cataloguing them. In collaboration with Mr. Gordon Duff, Mr. Edmond also prepared a paper, with notes and collations, on the books printed by Sweynheym and Pannartz at Subiaco and Rome, this joint contribution being by far the most complete and scientific survey of the work of these printers that has yet been published. From Mr. Duff's notes we learn that 'the total number of books issued from this press, including the unknown *Donatus*, is 64, and of these the Rylands Library (Spencer Collection) has 57, the

Bodleian 55, Lord Crawford 47, and the British Museum 46; to which last figure, however, two additions have been made since Proctor printed his index. From the figure which he gives as that of the total output of the firm it is evident that Mr. Duff does not admit the existence of several books assigned to it in Herr Burger's list on the testimony of Panzer and Dr. Copinger. In the case of Sweynheym and Pannartz, owing to the catalogue of their impressions appended to their supplication to the Pope in 1472, we have unusually good means of ascertaining what amount of their work has perished, and it is satisfactory to find that this reduces itself to the 'Donatus pro puerulis,' printed doubtless, as an advertisement at the outset of their career. In estimating the ravages wrought by time a very strong line has to be drawn between popular and learned books, and it should be more generally recognized than it is, that the extent to which learned works of all kinds have been preserved is as striking as the extent to which popular books have been destroyed.

In the task of helping to preserve the books printed by Sweynheym and Pannartz, the English collectors of the first half of the nineteenth century certainly did their full share; but the following extract from Mr. Duff's paper will show that in other respects their misdeeds were grievous:

'At the beginning of the nineteenth century, when Lord Spencer collected his library, an old binding was anathema. A spotless copy in original binding would be immediately sent to Charles Lewis, or some fellow-miscreant, to be bound in full morocco and the edges cut

and gilt. How it was done I do not know, but they managed to hammer and press the book to about half its proper thickness, and then bound it up in a vice-like binding. If quires of ten leaves did not suit them (and it rarely did) they cut the leaves apart and overcast them into quires of eight. This overpressing and tight binding had two bad effects; it flattened out all the impress made by the type on the paper, taking away its beauty and making the page look like a lithograph, and it made it quite impossible to determine the real structure of the book.

'I cannot resist one story to show the utter absence of all interest in bibliography in the early collectors. Earl Spencer came into possession of the historic volume containing the so-called Mentelin editions of Terence and Valerius Maximus, bound together in the original binding, with a coeval manuscript note saying that the books had been bought at the Nordlingen Fair in 1470 from the printer himself, Adolf Rusch of Ingwiller (Mentelin's son-in-law). This particular volume had been quoted by Seemiller, Panzer, and other writers as a most important piece of evidence on the early history of printing. What did Lord Spencer do? He wanted the Valerius Maximus, but had already a fair copy of the Terence in green morocco. So the volume was broken up; the Valerius Maximus sent to Walther to bind in full red morocco, the leaf with the inscription torn out of the Terence and inserted (loose) in the other copy, while the Terence itself was sold as a duplicate.

'Anyone who has read Dibdin's tour on the Continent will remember his many purchases for the Althorp Library of books from the libraries of monasteries, where, as he tells us, they had lain untouched on the shelves from the day they were bought from the printer—spotless, and in their original bindings.

'Now they stand on the shelves of a modern library in the full morocco of Lewis, or Hering, or Kalthoeber, and

with almost all the human interest beaten out of them. This rebinding has played havoc with blank leaves, cancels, and many other things, so that although the Spencer set of Sweynheym and Pannartz books is unrivalled as a complete set for reference, it is not to be compared for bibliographical purposes with many smaller collections.'

Strongly as this denunciation is worded it is not one whit stronger than the facts justify, and some of the best men—Thomas Grenville, for instance, who noted with his own hand that his First Folio Shakespeare when it came into his possession was in its original binding, which he replaced with the inevitable red morocco by Lewis—were the worst offenders.

As an appendix to the papers by Mr. Duff and Mr. Edmond, there is printed a collation by quires of all the known Sweynheym and Pannartz books, which should lighten the task of several companies of bibliographers in the near future.

Altogether this section of the Society's Transactions is an excellent example of the wisdom of Mr. Edmond's doctrine that papers on other subjects should be mingled with those of purely Scottish interest. Would that he were still alive to do yet more good work!

English Heraldic Book-Stamps figured and described by Cyril Davenport. Constable & Co.

Of all marks of ownership in books, that of stamping the possessor's arms in gold on the covers of a good leather binding is the most dignified and durable. The number of English collectors who

have stamped their books in this way is not very great, and we doubt if Mr. Davenport would have found it easy to add another hundred stamps to his volume, however diligently he had sought for them. The very appetite with which men like Thomas Rawlinson, for instance, collected, made it impossible for them to reclothe all their acquisitions in handsome bindings, for though binding was doubtless cheaper in the eighteenth century than it is now, old books were cheaper still, so that the new jackets would mostly have cost more than the books. It is rather significant indeed that more than a few of the stamps which Mr. Davenport has figured belonged to men who never made any mark as collectors, and who were thus perhaps the better able to pay for handsome bindings because they had only a few books to bind. However this may be, any modern book-buyer who becomes possessed of a volume bearing an armorial stamp naturally desires to know to whom the arms belonged, and Mr. Davenport has used his wide knowledge of heraldry and his artistic skill to excellent purpose in describing and figuring the three hundred or so book-stamps which illustrate his fine volume. The stamps have been most carefully copied and reproduced, the armorial bearings are described with full technical accuracy, and a series of business-like biographies state the main facts of the careers of all the important owners. In addition to this, Mr. Davenport has prefaced his book with an admirable introduction, which offers a brief compendium of English heraldry, with a series of pretty little illustrations of its own. The book is also very well

indexed, so that the collectors of English bindings with heraldic stamps will find in it everything they need.

The Tragical Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke, Shakespeare's Sonnets. Tercentenary Edition. Printed by T. J. Cobden-Sanderson at The Doves Press, 15 Upper Mall, Hammersmith.

Two of the most entirely satisfactory of the many fine volumes issued from the Doves Press are those containing Milton's 'Paradise Lost' and 'Paradise Regain'd,' with his minor poems. Mr. Sanderson has now set himself to print a few of the most important of Shakespeare's plays, and the first of these, an edition of 'Hamlet,' together with a tercentenary edition of the Sonnets, should be as welcome to lovers of Shakespeare as were the earlier books to those of Milton. The 'Hamlet' combines with practically the whole of the quarto text the passages printed for the first time in 1623. Both books retain the original spelling, majuscules, and punctuation. The Sonnets, printed two on a page so that each 'opening' shows four at a time, enable the beautiful type and presswork of the Doves Press to be seen to the highest advantage. In the 'Hamlet' the names of the speakers and the stage directions are all printed in red, so that every page has a very gay appearance. Ornament, as usual, is confined to a few fine capitals. In their own style it may safely be said that each book marks a limit of typographical attainment.

A.W.P.

INDEX OF AUTHORS.

VOLUMES I.—X.

ALLNUTT, W. H.

James Gaven, II., 384-8.
The King's Printer at Shrewsbury, I., 355-64.
Notes on the Introduction of Printing-Presses into the smaller towns of England and Wales, after 1750 to the end of the Eighteenth Century, II., 242-59.

AXON, W. E. A.

The Church Library at Michelstadt-im-Odenwald, II., 405-12.
Cornaro in English, II., 120-9.
De Quincey and T. F. Dibdin, VIII., 267-74.
An Early Essay by Panizzi, III., 141-47.
Edward Edwards, III., 398-407.
The Juvenile Library, II., 67-81.
The Lady Margaret as a Lover of Literature, VIII., 34-41.
The Licensing of Montagu's 'Miscellanea Spiritualia,' II., 269-73.
A London Circulating Library in 1743, I., 377-8.
Michael the Bishop in Praise of Books, IV., 307-72.
On Christian Captive Indulgences in the British Museum, Lambeth Palace, and John Rylands Library, VII., 275-300.
Some Twentieth-Century Italian Chapbooks, V., 239-55.
Subsidised Indexing, VI., 281-303.

BALLINGER, JOHN.

Admission to Public Libraries in Great Britain, II., 210-17.
The Library Association at Cambridge, VI., 428-37.
The Library Association at Glasgow, VIII., 421-36.
The Library Association at Leeds, IV., 411-23.
A Municipal Library and its Public (The News Room; The Children; Lending Libraries and Branches; The Reference Library. Lectures and Exhibitions), IX., 66-79, 173-85, 309-22, 353-68; X., 188-200.
Richard Garnett, VII., 233-6.
Shakespeare and the Municipal Libraries, VII., 181-91.
The Trevecca Press, VI., 225-50.

BARRETT, F. T.

Richard Garnett, VII., 241-2.

BARWICK, G. F.
 Books Printed at Sea, I., 163-66.
 A Day's Work in the Reading Room of the British Museum, VI., 304-8.
 Humfrey Wanley and the Harleian Library, III., 24-35, 243.
 Impressas, VII., 140-8.
 Notes from the first French translation of 'The Vicar of Wakefield,' V., 134-9.
 Recent English Literature in Spain, VIII., 275-9.

BECK, F. G. M.
 A New Ipswich Book of 1548, X., 86-9.

BELL, H. I.
 Dafydd ab Gwilym, X., 44-61.
 Early Codices from Egypt, X., 303-13.

BELLOC, HILAIRE.
 The Catalogue of Danton's Library, I., 67-70.

BLADES, R. H.
 Who was Caxton? IV., 113-43.

BOURDILLON, F. W.
 Early Printing at Lyons, VI., 257-64.

BOOSE, JAMES R.
 The Libraries of Greater Britain, II., 183-9, 260-8; III., 214-26.

BRADSHAW, HENRY.
 Letters to Officials of the British Museum, V., 266-92, 431-42.

BROWN, F. H.
 The India Office Library, V., 256-65.

BROWN, JAMES DUFF.
 Descriptive Cataloguing, II., 135-40.
 Library Progress, I., 5-10.
 Practical Bibliography, IV., 144-51.
 Public Utilization of existing Libraries, V., 93-102.

BURPEE, L. J.
 Bibliography in Canada, VI., 403-27.

CHILD, MARY.
 Mr. Spectator and Shakespeare, VI., 360-79.

CHIVERS, CEDRIC.
 How to open a New Book, I., 323-5.

CHOLMELEY, ROBERT F.
 Bad Books, V., 225-38.
 A Book of Snobs, VI., 391-402.
 Boys' Libraries, IV., 11-21.

CLARKE, ARCHIBALD L.
 Allibone's 'Critical Dictionary of English Literature,' V., 419-30.
 Lessing as a Librarian, II., 376-83.
 Public Lending Libraries for the City of London, III., 135-40.
 The Reputed First Circulating Library in London, I., 274-97.

CRUNDEN, F. M.

How things are done in one American Library (St. Louis Public Library), I., 92-117, 147-51, 290-7, 384-407; II., 20-43.
The Public Library as a Factor in Industrial Progress, VII., 384-96.

DAVENPORT, CYRIL.

Forgeries in Bookbinding, II., 389-95.
King Charles I.'s Embroidered Bible, I., 373-6.
Some Popular Errors as to Old Bindings, II., 231-7.
Three Bindings with Little Giddings Stamps, I., 205-14.

DELISLE, LÉOPOLD.

Discovery of Pictures Stolen from a Manuscript at Mâcon, I., 45-8.
Souvenirs de Jeunesse (translated), IX., 201-24, 245-56.

DEWEY, MELVIL.

The Faculty Library, II., 238-41.
Printed Catalogue Cards from a Central Bureau, II., 130-4.

DIX, E. R. McC.

Irish Provincial Printing prior to 1701, II., 341-8.

DOBSON, AUSTIN.

On Certain Quotations in Walton's 'Angler,' II., 4-11.
On some Books and their Associations, IX., 132-42.
Richard Garnett (memorial verses), VII., 295.

DOUBLEDAY, W. E.

The American Library Association Conference, IV., 424-31.
The Library Association Conference at Bradford, VII., 437-46.
The Library Association Conference at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, V., 404-18.

The Open Access Question : A Reply, I., 187-94.

DOWDEN, EDWARD.

Richard Garnett, VII., 242-3.

DUFF, E. GORDON.

Adrian Kempe van Bouckhout and the New Testaments of 1536.
VII., 376-83.

The Assertio Septem Sacramentorum, IX., 1-16.

A Bookseller's Accounts, *circa* 1510, VIII., 256-66.

Early Chancery Proceedings concerning Members of the Book Trade, VIII., 408-20.

The Library of Richard Smith, VIII., 113-33.

Notes on Stationers from the Lay-Subsidy Rolls (1523-4), IX., 257-81.

The Printer of Borde's 'Introduction to Knowledge,' VIII., 30-3.

ENGLAND, GEORGE.

Goldsmith's 'Prospect of Society,' III., 327-38.

ESDAILE, ARUNDELL.

Public Schools and their Libraries, VII., 366-75.

Shakespeare Literature, 1904-5, VII., 167-80.

FABER, REGINALD S.
The Musée Dobrée at Nantes, V., 206-24.

FAIRCHILD, S. C.
American Notes, I., 100-8, 220-4, 330-6, 434-7; II., 218-20.

FLETCHER, W. Y.
Collectors of Broadsides, II., 12-9.
English Royal Collectors, I., 305-13.

FLOWER, R.
The Fate of the Baskerville Types, X., 251 *sq.*

FORTESCUE, G. K.
Richard Garnett, VII., 225-33.

FOVARGUE, H. W.
Notes on Library Legislation, I., 89-91.

GARNETT, RICHARD.
Early Arabian Paper-making, IV., 1-10.
Early Spanish American Printing, I., 139-51.
On the 'De Missione Legatorum Japonensium,' Macao, 1590,
II., 172-82.
Some Notes on Ancient Writing and Writing Materials, IV., 225-
35.

GARNETT, R., and GREEN, BERNARD R.
Mechanical Book-Carriers in the Library of Congress, II., 282-97.

GILES, LIONEL.
Les Matinées du Roi de Prusse, III., 148-63.

GRAINGE, ELEANOR.
An Eighteenth Century Book-Room, VIII., 63-8.

GREG, WALTER W.
Another Baconian Cipher, X., 418-42.
Bacon's Biliteral Cipher and its Applications, III., 41-53.
The Bibliographical History of the First Folio, IV., 258-85.
The Cambridge Beaumont and Fletcher; the Facsimiles of
Shakespeare's Poems and Pericles; Two Reviews, VII.,
192-224.
Facts and Fancies in Baconian Theory, IV., 47-64.
Henslowe, Collier, and the latest German Criticism, V., 293-304.
Old Plays and New Editions, III., 408-26.
On certain False Dates in Shakespearian Quartos, IX., 113-31,
381-409.
Tottel's Miscellany, V., 113-33.

HERBERT, J. A.
The Authorship of the 'Alphabetum Narrationum,' VI., 94-112.

HESSELS, J. H.
A Bibliographical Tour, IX., 282-308.
The so-called Gutenberg Documents, X., 152-67, 253-87, 386-417.

HILL, ALEXANDER.
Responsibility for the Public Taste, VII., 257-62

INDEX OF AUTHORS.

453

HOSMER, JAMES K.
In praise of the Nord, I., 132-38.

JACOBI, C. T.
Printing Inks, VII., 70-7.

JAGGARD, W.
False Dates in Shakespearian Quartos, X., 208-11.

JAST, L. STANLEY.
Accessions: the Checking of the Processes, I., 152-62.
The Problem of the Printed Catalogue, with a possible solution, II., 141-46.
A simple and economical plan for founding a Cataloguing Bureau for Public Libraries, V., 140-57.

JENNER, HENRY.
The Service-Books of the Latin Church, IV., 292-336.

JENNINGS, OSCAR.
Some Old Initial Letters, II., 44-59.

KERSHAW, S. W.
Archbishop Parker, collector and author, I., 379-406.

KOOPMAN, H. L.
Simplified Spelling from the Printer's Standpoint, X., 78-85.

LANG, ANDREW.
'Aucassin and Nicolete,' IV., 22-7.

LAYARD, GEORGE SOMES.
The Pooling of Private Libraries, I., 245-53.

LEA, EDITH.
The British Workman in English Fiction, VIII., 360-69.

LEE, ELIZABETH.
Recent Foreign Literature, IV., 85, 320, 403; V., 35, 210, 305, 359; VI., 45, 156, 288, 412; VII., 78, 209, 287, 411; VIII., 177, 239, 393; IX., 80, 186, 267, 369; X., 62, 134, 288, 371.

LEE, SIDNEY.
Notes and Additions to the Census of Copies of the Shakespeare First Folio, VII., 113-39.

MACALISTER, J. Y. W.
To the Subscribers and Contributors to 'The Library,' III., 440.

MACFARLANE, JOHN.
Pamphlets and the Pamphlet Duty of 1712, I., 298-304.
The Paper Duties of 1696-1713, I., 31-44.

MCKERROW, R. B.
A note on variations in certain copies of the 'Returne of Pasquill,' IV., 384-91.

MACLEHOSE, ROBERT.
Net Books. Why it is not practicable to make a reduction in their price to Libraries, V., 52-8.

MASON, T.
The London Government Act, 1899, as it affects London
Libraries, I., 25-30.

MINTO, JOHN.
The Exemption of Libraries from Local Rates. III., 256-60.
The Morisons of Perth, I., 254-62.
Public Library Statistics, II., 164-71.

MOORE, H. K.
Open Access in Public Lending Libraries, I., 49-61.

ORMEROD, JAMES.
The Writings of Oliver Wendell Holmes, IX., 17-35.

OSLER, WILLIAM.
The 'Religio Medici,' VII., 1-31.

PEDDIE, R. A.
Sale prices of Incunabula in 1901, III., 164-75; in 1903, V., 318-
36; in 1904, VI., 173-83.

PEPLOW, F. J.
Cotton Des Houssayes on the Duties and Qualifications of a
Librarian, V., 182-91.

PHILIP, A. J.
Raphael Trichet, VI., 354-59.
Robert Pocock of Gravesend, VIII., 280-85.

PITE, BERESFORD.
Architecture for Libraries, I., 326-52.

PLOMER, HENRY R.
An Analysis of the Civil War Newspaper, 'Mercurius Civicus,'
VI., 184-207.
Bishop Bancroft and a Catholic Press, VIII., 164-76.
The Booksellers of London Bridge, IV., 28-46.
A Cavalier's Library, V., 158-72.
A Chester Bookseller, 1667-700., IV., 373-83.
The Edinburgh Edition of Sidney's 'Arcadia,' I., 195-204.
An Examination of some existing copies of Hayward's 'Life and
Raigne of Henrie IV.,' III., 13-23.
A Glance at the Whittingham Ledgers, II., 147-63.
Henry Bynneman, printer, IX., 225-44.
Henry Denham, printer, X., 241-50.
The King's Printing House under the Stuarts, II., 353-75.
The Law Suits of Richard Pynson, X., 115-33.
On the value of Publisher's Lists, III., 427-33.
The Oxinden Letters, VI., 29-62.
A Printer's Bill in the Seventeenth Century, VII., 32-45.
The Printers of Shakespeare's Plays and Poems, VII., 149-66.
St. Paul's Cathedral and its Bookselling Tenants, III., 261-320.
A Secret Press at Stepney in 1596, IV., 236-42.
Secret Printing during the Civil War, V., 374-403.

INDEX OF AUTHORS.

455

PLOMER, HENRY, R.—*continued.*

Some dealings of the Long Parliament with the Press, X., 90-7.
Some notes on the Latin and Irish Stocks of the Company of Stationers, VIII., 286-315.
Some Private Presses of the Present Century, I., 407-34.
Stephen Bulkley, printer, VIII., 42-56.
Stephen Vallenger, II., 108-12.
Thomas East, printer, II., 298-310.
Westminster Hall and its Booksellers, VI., 380-90.

POLLARD, ALFRED W.

Anthony Panizzi, II., 225-30.
The Bibliography of Milton, X., 1-33.
Book-Illustration in the Fifteenth Century, II., 190-209.
The Franks collection of Armorial Book-Stamps, III., 115-34.
Gutenberg, Fust, Schoeffer, and the invention of Printing, VIII., 69-112.
Herbert Putnam, I., 241-44.
Karl Dzitzko, I., 353-54.
Léopold Delisle, II., 1-3.
The Library Association and its Branches, VIII., 316-36.
A Meditation on Directories, II., 82-90.
Melville Dewey, II., 337-40.
A New Oxford Book of 1517, X., 212 sq.
The Objects and Methods of Bibliographical Collations and Descriptions, VIII., 193-224.
Practical Bibliography, IV., 151-62.
Recent Caxtoniana, VI., 337-53.
Recent English purchases at the British Museum, VI., 1-28; IX., 323-32.
Richard Copley Christie, I., 129-31.
Richard Garnett, I., 1-3; VII., 244-56.
Robert Proctor, V., 1-34.
Robert Proctor's Work, V., 192-205.
The Rowfant Book, VI., 309-36.
The Siege of Rhodes, VII., 423-36.
Sienese Tavolette, IX., 97-112.
Two Illustrated Italian Bibles, III., 227-55.
William Morris, II., 113-19.
Woodcut in English Plays, printed before 1660, I., 71-88.

POWER, D'ARCY.

Dr. Walter Bayley and his Works, VIII., 370-407.

PROCTOR, ROBERT.

Early Pestblätter, III., 3-12.
The Early Printers of Köln, IV., 392-402.
The 'Gutenberg' Bible, II., 60-66.
Incunabula at Grenoble, I., 215-24.

PROCTOR, ROBERT—*continued*.
 On two Lyonnese Editions of the 'Ars Moriendi,' III., 339-48.
 Ulrich von Ellenbog and the Press of S. Ulrich at Augsburg,
 IV., 163-79.

REDGRAVE, GILBERT R.
 Authors' Own Copies, VI., 251-56.
 Evelyn's Essay on 'Publick Employment and an Active Life,'
 II., 349-52.
 The First Four Editions of English Bards and Scotch Reviewers,
 I., 18-24.
 The Lady Dilke Gift to the National Art Library, VII., 263-74.
 The Water-Marks in Paper, V., 91.

RIVERS, JOHN.
 A French Utopia, VI., 265-80.
 'From an Old Directory,' V., 173-81.
 How Great Minds Jump, IV., 243-50.
 Shakespeare à la Française, VI., 78-85.

RIVINGTON, CHARLES R.
 Notes on the Stationers' Company, IV., 355-66.

SAVAGE, ERNEST A.
 The Care of Books in Early Irish Monasteries, X., 362-70.
 Samuel Pepys' Library, IV., 286-91.

SCHOLDERER, VICTOR.
 The Development of Shakespeare's Fools, X., 201-07.
 The Legend of Archbishop Udo, IV., 337-52.
 Ludwig Hohenwang's Second Press at Basel, X., 98-100.

SHEAVYN, PHOEBE.
 The Livelihood of the Professional Writer, *circa* 1600, VIII.,
 1-29.
 Patrons and Professional Writers under Elizabeth and James I.,
 VII., 301-36.
 Writers and Official Censors under Elizabeth and James I.,
 VIII., 134-63.
 Writers and the Publishing Trade, *circa* 1600, VII., 337-65.

SKETCHLEY, R. E. D.
 English Book Illustration of to-day, III., 34, 176, 271, 358.

SMITH, G.
 The Frankfort Book Mart, I., 167-86.

SPIELMANN, M. H.
 Art Exhibitions and Art Catalogues, I., 118-22.
 John Ruskin, I., 225-40.

STEELE, ROBERT.
 The Casket Sonnets, IX., 422-28.
 Materials for the History of the Lithuanian Bible, VIII., 57-62.
 What Fifteenth Century Books are about, IV., 337-354;
 V., 337-58; VI., 137-72; VIII., 225-55.

INDEX OF AUTHORS.

457

STEELE, ROBERT LEWIS.
Printers and Books in Chancery, X., 101-06.

STRANGE, E. F.
The Decorative Work of Gleeson White, I., 11-7.

SYMONS, ARTHUR,
Richard Garnett, VII., 244-6.

TEDDER, H. R.
Richard Garnett, VII., 236-40.

THOMAS, HENRY.
The Cervantes Collection in the British Museum, IX., 429-43.

THOMAS, T. H.
A National Museum and Library for Wales, VI., 212-24.

THORNE, W. B.
The Bibliographical Collections of the late William Blades and the late Talbot Baines Reed, III., 349-57.
A Famous Printer: Samuel Richardson, II., 396-404.
A Seventeenth Century Cookery Book, IV., 180-88.

TILLEY, ARTHUR.
A Paris Bookseller of the Sixteenth Century—Galliot Du Pré, IX., 36-65, 143-72.

VOYNICH, WILFRID.
On the study of Early Printed Books: Notes from a lecture by, IV., 189-99.

WEALE, W. H. JAMES.
The newly discovered 'Missale Speciale,' I., 62-6.
Two Notes for Art Libraries, I., 365-72.

WEEKS, RAYMOND.
The 'Chancum de Willame,' a French MS., preserved in England, VI., 113-36.

WELCH, CHARLES.
The Guildhall Library and Museum, IV., 68-84.

WELSH, CHARLES.
The Children's Books that have lived, I., 314-22.

WESTON, JESSIE L.
The Perceval Legend in Literature, V., 59-90.

WHEATLEY, H. B.
The British Museum Revised Rules for Cataloguing, I., 263-73.
Leather for Bookbinding, II., 311-20.

WILLIAMS, C.
Thomas Love Peacock, VII., 397-422.

WILSON, J. DOVER.
A Date in the Marprelate Controversy, VIII., 337-59.
Euphues and the Prodigal Son, X., 337-61.
A New Tract from the Marprelate Press, X., 225-40.

X.

H H

THE DE LA MORE PRESS: PRINTED BY ALEXANDER MORING LTD.
32 GEORGE STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, LONDON, W.

FROM THE DE LA MORE PRESS LIST

ESSAYS BY MEREJKOWSKI

Translated from the Russian by G. A. MOUNSEY. Fcap. 8vo, boards.
1/6 net each.

THE LIFE-WORK OF HENDRIK IBSEN
THE LIFE-WORK OF PLINY THE YOUNGER
THE LIFE-WORK OF MONTAIGNE
THE LIFE-WORK OF CALDERON
THE LIFE-WORK OF FLAUBERT
MARCUS AURELIUS
THE ACROPOLIS

A MANUAL OF COSTUME AS ILLUSTRATED BY MONUMENTAL BRASSES

By HERBERT DRAITT. Profusely illustrated. Demy 8vo, gilt top, 10/6 net.
Indispensable Handbook for all interested in Brasses, Costume, and
Medieval Archaeology.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE IDEA OF GOD: An Inquiry
into the Origins of Religions

By GRANT ALLEN. Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. 3/6 net.

CHARACTER BUILDING

By BOOKER T. WASHINGTON. With frontispiece. Large crown 8vo, cloth
gilt. 6/- net.

WORKING WITH THE HANDS

By BOOKER T. WASHINGTON, author of "Up from Slavery," etc. Illustrated.
Large crown 8vo, cloth gilt. 6/- net.

UP FROM SLAVERY: being the Autobiography of Booker T.
Washington

Author of "Working with the Hands," etc. Crown 8vo., cloth. 6/- net.
"One of the most remarkable autobiographies of the day." — *Black and White*.

THE HEART OF A GARDEN

By MRS. MARRIOTT WATSON. With numerous fine illustrations. Royal
8vo. 7/6 net.

THE STUDY OF PLANT LIFE

By M. C. STOPES, D.Sc. London. Illustrated with plates and numerous
diagrams. Designed cover. Royal 8vo, cloth. 2/6 net.

A FIRST GERMAN COURSE FOR SCIENCE STUDENTS
With diagrams. Square 8vo, cloth.

2/6 net.

A SECOND GERMAN COURSE FOR SCIENCE STUDENTS
Square 8vo, cloth.

2/6 net.

Readings from recent German scientific publications, selected, arranged,
and annotated by H. G. FIEDLER, Professor of German at the University of
Oxford, and F. E. SANDBACH, Lecturer in German at the University of
Birmingham.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, ALEXANDER MORING LTD. LONDON W

LIBRARY OF LITURGIOLOGY & ECCLESIOLOGY

HIERURGIA ANGLICANA

Documents and Extracts illustrative of the Ceremonial of the Anglican Church since the Reformation. This new edition of a very famous work, published by the Cambridge Camden Society in 1848, has been revised, enlarged, and classified by the Very Rev. VERNON STALEY.

Among the contents are the following:—The Ornaments of the Church and the Vestures of the Ministers, the Font, Chancels, and Rood Screens, Processions, Position of the Minister, Postures of the People, Reverences, the Sign of the Cross, the Eucharistic Elements, Reservation, Incense, Funeral Customs, Penitential Discipline, Confession and Absolution, Fasting before Communion, Fasting Days, Seasons for Marriage, Dedication Feasts, Prayer for the Faithful Departed, Celebration of the Eucharist at Funerals, Invocation of Saints, etc. Three volumes, demy 8vo, 7*6* net each.

‘The three parts constitute a valuable mass of information upon post-Reformation usages.’—*Saturday Review*.

THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK OF KING EDWARD VI.

This work is a reprint *verbatim et literatim* of the first English Book of Common Prayer, issued in the year 1549. Demy 8vo, vii. + 374 pp. Price 5*-* net.

ESSAYS ON CEREMONIAL

By Various Authors. This volume contains the following Essays:—I. English Ceremonial, by E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley. II. Ancient Liturgical Customs now falling into disuse, by J. Wickham Legg. III. English Liturgical Colours, by E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley. IV. Church Vestments, by Percy Dearmer. V. The Altar and its Furniture, by Percy Dearmer. VI. Some Remarks on the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., by E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley. VII. The Genius of the Roman Rite, by Edmund Bishop. Essays II., IV., V. are illustrated. Demy 8vo, viii. + 313 pp. Price 7*6* net.

ORDO ROMANUS PRIMUS

With Translation, Introduction, Notes, and Appendices. By E. G. CUTHERBERT F. ATCHLEY, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S. With many illustrations. 7*6* net.

ECCLESIOLOGICAL ESSAYS

By J. WICKHAM LEGG, M.D., L.R.C.P. With many illustrations. Demy 8vo, cloth, 7*6* net.

A complete Catalogue and Specimen Page will be sent on application.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, ALEXANDER MORING LTD. LONDON W.

